The Theory of *Karman* in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*

Achim Bayer

STUDIA PHILOLOGICA BUDDHICA
Monograph Series
XXVI

Tokyo • The International Institute for Buddhist Studies • 2010

The Theory of Karman in the Abhidharmasamuccaya

STUDIA PHILOLOGICA BUDDHICA
Monograph Series
XXVI

The Theory of *Karman* in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*

Achim Bayer

Tokyo
The International Institute for Buddhist Studies
of
The International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies
2010

The Theory of *Karman* in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*

Achim Bayer

Tokyo
The International Institute for Buddhist Studies
of
The International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies
2010

Published by the International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the ICPBS:
2-8-9 Kasuga, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 112-0003, Japan

First published 2010
Printed in Japan by Morimoto Printing Company, Tokyo

ISBN 978-4-906267-64-4

Correspondence regarding all editorial matters should be sent to the Director of the International Institute for Buddhist Studies in Tokyo.

und doch ist dies die Eigenschaft des Geistes, dass er den Geist ewig anregt

Johann-Wolfgang von Goethe

PREFACE

As a contribution to the ongoing research into the history and thought of the Yogācāra tradition, I would like to present this edition, translation and analysis of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*'s section on *karman*. In the last decades, various studies have touched upon the *karman* doctrine in Yogācāra systematics, wherefore it appeared appropriate to dedicate a more comprehensive study to it. The *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (AS) exposes the central doctrines on *karman* in a section that is relatively brief when compared to, for example, the treatment of *karman* in the *Yogācārabhūmi*. The style of the AS being extremely dense, I found it necessary to add an edition and translation of the respective sections in the commentary, the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* (ASBh), as well as endnotes that shed light on various additional aspects, such as the canonical sources of the AS, or its doctrinal position in comparison to the *Yogācārabhūmi* (YBh) , the *Mahāyānasaṃgraha* (MSg), the *Xianyang shengjiao lun* and the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (AKBh). In the same manner, the ASBh is compared with the above sources and the *Triṃśikābhāṣya* (TrBh). I also found it useful also to comment on peculiarities in the Chinese and Tibetan translations of the AS, ASBh and the *Abhidharmasamuccayavyākhyā*, and on diplomatic features of the MSS and block prints. In addition, my notes point to explanations in various Tibetan commentaries, like those of Bu ston, dPang lo tsā ba, Mi pham or gZhan dga'. Occasionally, I discuss the views of Walpola Rahula, who translated the AS into French. Rahula's notes often go beyond the Sanskrit Abhidharma tradition and offer a Theravāda Buddhist perspective, at times a modern one. The "Additional Leaf" (a leaf of the ASVy MS that is contained among the folios of the ASBh MS) is also compared to parallels in the Tibetan and Chinese translations of the AKBh, and to the Chinese text of the **Mahāvibhāṣā*.

Time being limited for the preparation of this thesis, I could not seriously aim at perfection in all of the above-mentioned tasks, wherefore I refer to, for example, enlightening comments in dPang lo's commentary occasionally. In other cases where his views might be equally valuable, time did not permit me to refer to his commentary. The same applies to my reflections on Xuanzang's terminology, the references to rGyal tshab rje's commentary, and so on.

The introductory matter contains sections on the textual witnesses, an outline of contents, remarks on the structure of the AS, especially the *karman* section, and on my editorial technique. To those are added a list of Tibetan and Chinese commentaries, as well as reflections on the Tibetan translations and on the early transmission of the AS in Tibet.

Acknowledgements

I would first of all like to thank my academic advisor, Lambert Schmithausen. His far-reaching advice and encouragement during the years of writing this thesis were of a

completely different nature than the mere fulfilment of the duties of his position,[1] a true example of personal commitment and unwavering attention, while consistently encouraging his students to disagree with his point of view where another is well-founded. In Kyoto, Professors Noritoshi Aramaki, Khang dkar Tshul khrims skal bzang, Werner Knobl, Robert Kritzer, Katsumi Mimaki and Gijin Muroji generously lent their precious time to my research. Their helpful comments were so numerous that I could not account for them in an appropriate manner. In addition, Professor Mimaki gave me the possibility to present my thesis in a series of readings at Kyoto University in the Winter term of 2002. I was also kindly admitted to attend two reading circles on the *Abhidharmakośa*, one under the guidance of Professor Kritzer at Notre Dame Women's College, the other under Professors Nobuchiyo Odani and Yoshifumi Honjō at Ōtani University. In Munich, I had the chance to present this thesis in the course of three colloquia, receiving valuable feedback from Professors Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Adelheid Mette and Monika Zin. The commitee members of my Ph.D. examination at Hamburg University 2005 presented me with feedback well beyond their duty, so am I indebted to Professors David Jackson, Klaus-Dieter Mathes and especially Dr. Felix Erb, one of my foremost teachers for Abhidharma systematics. The results of my research on the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* in Tibet were the subject of a paper read at the conference of the International Association of Tibetan Studies in Königswinter, 2006, and I would like to thank Dr. Helmut Eimer for his feedback, and especially Professor Franz-Karl Ehrhard for his long-standing support.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Orna Almogi, Shayne Clarke, Martin Delhey, Akimichi Eda, Yasmin Fischer, Andrew Glass, Oliver Gerken, Szymon Grzelak, Richard Holzberger, Kazuo Kanō, Andrea Kerekesi, Jowita and Ralf Kramer, Burkhard Quessel, Iain Sinclair, Jaqueline Tenschert, Ryan Ward, Christian Wittern, Michael Zimmermann, and others, for their support and friendship. This thesis was written while receiving a scholarship from the Japanese Ministry of Education, then holding the position of a research associate at the Ludwig-Maximilians University, Munich from 2004 to 2006, and after that while engaged in a research project on the preliminary exercises (*sngon 'gro*) in the 'Bri-gung bKa'-brgyud tradition. I am sincerely grateful to all those who made the years of research possible!

[1] Cf. ECO, *Tesi di laurea*, p. 198 ("...ha fatto solo il suo dovere.").

INTRODUCTION

General Introduction: The Abhidharmasamuccaya

As a general introduction I would like to present some basic information about the era of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, on the current of thought it belonged to, and on its purpose as a scholastic treatise. The origins of Abhidharma systematization lay in the need to organize and summarize the transmitted canonical material.[2] Once Abhidharma scholarship was established, the construction of a coherent system of scholasticism[3] from the transmitted word of the Buddha (or what was believed to be that) became one of its main objectives. The need to do so did not only arise from disputations with other, non-Buddhist, schools of thought. Abhidharma also had a self-propelling aspect: as the quantity of systematic and exegetical treatises increased, so did their diversity. Correspondingly, the number of scholars who set out to refute one or another (mis-)interpretation grew. The culture of analysis and debate that developed over the centuries is recorded in works like the *Kathāvatthu*, the **Mahāvibhāṣā* and so on.

Among the Abhidharma treatises, the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* is one of the less controversial ones, in so far as it (generally) does not lash out at Buddhist opponents. Comparing the AS section on *karman* with, for example, that of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, the AS appears to rather step around the controversial issues. And even where such issues are touched upon, no opponent is named or refuted. An exception in our section on *karman* is the false doctrine that whatever is done with pleasure should have a pleasurable result. That idea is, in any case, so fundamentally opposed to the most basic Buddhist teachings that we can safely assume no informed Buddhist scholar adhered to it by the time of Asaṅga.

That is not to say that the AS is totally opposed to scholastic debate. On the contrary, a whole chapter (the *Sāṃkathyaviniścaya*) is dedicated to questions of disputation. As a whole, the AS is primarily a manual of monastic scholasticism. It was probably used as a compendium to introduce Buddhist monks[4] to Abhidharma thought, including debate, before they could go on to more specialized, or more delicate, issues. There is admittedly not historical evidence that the AS served as an Abhidharma primer in India–it was later used for that purpose in Tibet–but it may also have been composed to propagate a new brand of thought in established scholarly circles. Even with that

---

[2] FRAUWALLNER (*Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 61) traces the origination of Buddhist scholasticism back to "the natural need to pervade the transmitted doctrine as thoroughly as possible." On the aim of Abhidharma systematics, see also SCHMITHAUSEN, *External World*, pp. 11. 50, and my note on "*avyākṛta*" ad AS 53,6.

[3] There has been some discussion on whether the term "scholasticism" can be applied in the context of traditional Buddhism at all. See, e.g., VAN DER KUIJP, "Buddhism and Language", p. 563. I use this term in the more general sense, i.e. "close adherence to the traditional teachings or methods of a school or sect" (*Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, s.v., point 2a).

[4] I do not know to what extent nuns were trained in Abhidharma in the fourth century CE, but judging from the fact that women do not appear as Abhidharma scholars in the scriptures, advanced Abhidharma studies were probably the privilege of the monks.

underlying intention, another purpose than that of an introductory manual is not easily found.

Aspects of Yogācāra Thought in the AS

The AS is thus a sound and solid handbook of Abhidharma, mostly in the sense of a rational systematisation of pre-Mahāyāna sūtra thought, but it also contains ideas and terminology that belong to Mahāyāna Buddhism and to the Yogācāra school of Buddhist thought. In fact, both the Chinese and the Tibetan traditions classify it as a straightforward Mahāyāna treatise: the Chinese title has the word "Mahāyāna" (大乘) prefixed to "Abhidharmasamuccaya", and in the Tibetan tradition, the AS is considered the exemplary treatise of the "upper Abhidharma", i.e. Mahāyānistic Abhidharma, in contrast to the "lower", i.e. Hīnayānistic, Abhidharma, represented by the AKBh.[5]

There was some discussion in Tibet whether the AS, apart from being a Mahāyāna work, should be considered a "summary of the common vehicle" (*theg pa thun mong gi sdom*), which means a treatise covering all vehicles.[6] As BU STON reports, some Tibetan scholars objected to that classification, pointing to Abhayākaragupta who had called it Mahāyāna treatise. That view, anyhow, is dismissed by BU STON: The AS, he says, is indeed a Mahāyāna treatise, but it also summarizes all three vehicles, just like the *Yogācārabhūmi* (Tib. *sa sde*).[7] BU STON 's view is generally accepted among traditional Tibetan scholars.[8] From their point of view, both the YBh and the AS were written down by the great Bodhisattva Asaṅga after he received instruction from Maitreya in Tuṣita heaven–there should be no history of thought in the philological sense in them.

The Tibetan catalogues have put the AS into the *cittamātra* (*sems-tsam*) section of the *bsTan-'gyur*. That, of course, does not mean that it is not a work of Abhidharma. It is just that the Abhidharma section of the *bsTan-'gyur* is reserved to non-Mahāyānist works. The Lhan-dkar-ma catalogue lists AS and ASBh in the section on the "vijñāna treatises" (*rnam par shes pa'i bstan bcos*), which roughly corresponds to the idea of *sems tsam* in the Peking *bstan 'gyur*.[9]

If the AS, as its title indicates, was written as a compendium, a summary, of Abhidharma, the question arises for what purpose such a summary may have been written. FRAUWALLNER suggests that Asaṅga wrote this work in order to enrich the Yogācāra system with fundamental systematics to that it would measure up to the non-Māhāyanist

---

[5] See, e.g., DUNG DKAR, *Shes bya rab gsal*, s.v. *mngon pa gong 'og gnyis*, or ROERICH, *Blue Annals: Part I*, p. 233.

[6] A similar example is Nāgārjuna's *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* which was considered a treatise of the "common vehicle" by some authors (see RUEGG, *Two Prolegomena*, p. 232).

[7] See BU STON, *Chos kyi 'byung gnas*, fol. 104b6f. and NISHIOKA, "Butun bukkyōshi II", p. 57. Cf. OBERMILLER, *History of Buddhism*, vol. 2, p. 140.

[8] See, for example, 'JIGS BRAL YE SHES RDO RJE, *The Nyingma School*, p. 90.

[9] See LALOU, *Les textes Bouddhiques*, p. 334.

dogmatic systems of his time.[10] "Yogācāra school" here surely refers to the tradition of the Maitreya treatises which are more concerned with absolute, ontological questions and less with scholastic categorization of phenomena. The scenario proposed by FRAUWALLNER is thus that the followers of a school that hitherto had no Abhidharma in the traditional sense were to be furnished with a compendium of such doctrines. That is surely possible, but I think it is clear that at the time the *Yogācārabhūmi* was completed, Maitreya's Mahāyāna tradition and the scholastic tradition of the earlier YBh had merged to a great extent, if not completely. At that point, there was no need for scholastic categorizations as such: the *Yogācārabhūmi* itself was already a true treasury of those.

Given the many parallels between the AS and the YBh it is quite certain that one was composed with full knowledge of the other, or some earlier version of it. The question is thus whether the AS may not be a summary of the completed YBh, enriched with some later inventions or even Mahīśāsaka influences. Again, in such a case, the question arises for what purpose it was composed. It is at least hard to see any necessity for composing such a summary as long as the YBh itself is studied, and especially as soon as summaries like the *Viniścayasaṃgrahaṇī* (VinSg) and the other four *saṃgrahaṇīs* exist, and even more so as soon as the *Xianyang shengjiao lun* was composed, a work equally ascribed to Asaṅga and considered a summary of the YBh.[11] That holds true even though I partly agree with CONZE that "The *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* [...] suffers from exessive diffuseness and imprecision."[12]

One hypothesis which I wish to propose is that the AS partially grew simultaneously with the YBh, that it (or parts of it) was used as an Abhidharma primer in those scholastic circles which brought forth the YBh, and that the AS was gradually enriched with doctrines up to the *trikāya* doctrine and similar advanced beliefs. It is surely just a hypothesis for which I have no hard evidence, but I think is fit to explain certain ideo-historical peculiarities of this text. The other hypothesis I would like to propose is that some commentaries appearing under the name of a great scholar may actually have been lecture notes (similar to the Tibetan *zin bris* genre). For the sake of simplicity I would like to present a rather drastic example: What if the AS and the *Xianyang shengjiao lun* were simply transcripts of lectures given by the same scholar to different audiences at different stages in his life, edited by different students? I do not assume that things actually happened in that way, but some degree of multi-authoring is quite probable even with works much shorter than the YBh. I would like the reader to keep those *possibilities* in mind when reading through the analysis below.

Bu-ston's above-mentioned discussion on the AS as a "summary of the common vehicle" (*theg pa thun mong gi sdom*) already suggests that the AS might not be the

---

[10] *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 327: "Der Abhidharmasamuccayaḥ [...] mit dem er in Anlehnung an die Mahīśāsaka-Schule der Yogācāra-Schule die grundlegende Dogmatik gab." See also id., "Abhidharma-Studien I", p. 32.

[11] FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 327f.: "eine systematische Zusammenfassung der Lehren des riesigen *Yogācārabhūmiśāstram*."

[12] CONZE, *Buddhist Thought in India*, p. 251.

straightforward Yogācāra Mahāyāna treatise as which it may appear at first sight. I would therefore like to take a look at some indicative doctrinal factors.[13]

The section on *karman*, quite laconically mentions the terms *vāsanā* and *bīja* once each,[14] while the Yogācāra term *ālayavijñāna* is not mentioned even once. In the whole AS, the term *ālayavijñāna* appears not more than six times, with all six occurrences in the *Lakṣaṇasamuccaya* section, i.e. in the first third of the work.[15] As Lambert SCHMITHAUSEN has observed, even those rare occurrences mostly appear in passages where the *ālayavijñāna* fulfills solely the function of a substratum that guarantees the continuity of consciousness and karmic fruition. At some point, Yogācāra scholarship claimed that the *ālayavijñāna* has an object of cognition, a prerequisite for a *vijñāna* in the Abhidharma sense, but that idea is absent in the AS.[16] Another advanced concept, *kliṣṭaṃ manas*, is never mentioned explicitly, but it seems to be doctrinally implied in an explanation of *manas* at AS 12,2-5 and in the doctrine of "stable forms of mind and secondary factors" that are taught to persist during the "attainment of cessation" (*nirodha-samāpatti*, see AS 11,1). Commenting upon at that passage (AS 11,1), ASBh 9,21 identifies those "stable" aspects as *kliṣṭaṃ manas*, and although that seems to be accurate, I cannot positively exlude that the AS author originally meant the *ālayavijñāna*, or both.[17]AS 13,11 comments on the *saṃjñāvedayitanirodha*, basically to the same effect. Another reference to *kliṣṭaṃ manas* could be AS 23,2-4, mentioning a kind of *manas* which is undetermined by its very nature.[18]

Therefore, the AS clearly differs from Yogācāra treatises like the *Mahāyānasaṃgraha*, where the proof of the *ālayavijñāna* plays a central role,[19] and even

---

[13] On the relative chronology of the AS, see also AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, pp. 9-11 and FUNAHASHI, "Sengo", especially p. 32f.

[14] FRAUWALLNER (*Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 328) states that the concepts of *bīja* and *vāsanā* possibly stem from the Mahīśāsaka school, but he unfortunately does not go into further detail. His statement is possibly based on the assumption that Asaṅga belonged to the Mahīśāsaka school before becoming a Yogācāra scholar (see below). It is therefore not certain whether *vāsanā* here actually points to a concept that was included in the AS based on Yogācāra sources, or to a Mahīśāsaka doctrine that was to gain importance in Yogācāra philosophy. On *vāsanā* in Pāli texts and in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, see WALDRON, *The Buddhist Unconscious*, p. 218f., n. 15, on *bīja*, *ibid.*, pp. 26f. and 73-76, DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 177 and the references *ibid.*, p. 227, n. 163.

[15] AS 3,4, 3,9 (not in AS MS), AS 12,1, 12,3, 28,9 and 30,21 (in AS MS) and AS 32,9 (not in MS). See also the synonyms at AS 12,2: *vipākavijñāna* and *ādānavijñāna*.

[16] See SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 85ff, esp. p. 100. The quite advanced concept that the *ālayavijñāna* is accompanied by secondary mental factors (see *ibid.*, pp. 61, 100, 338, n. 424, and p. 400, n. 700) may alluded to at AS 30,20f., but the passage is as cryptic as its commentary at ASBh 44,15-20. See also my notes on *saṃjñā* ad ASBh 63,16.

[17] See SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 101, p. 296, n. 220, and p. 401, n. 706.

[18] See also AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 242, n. 312, on AS 23,2-4.

[19] See FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 328f.

the ASBh contains an extensive argument for the *ālayavijñāna*–a quotation from the *Viniścayasaṃgrahaṇī* of the YBh.[20] As a whole, *ālayavijñāna* occurs thirty-four times in the ASBh.[21]

The *Mahāyānasaṃgraha* also explains the purely mental nature of all phenomena in detail,[22] a doctrine that came to be representative of Asaṅga's tradition later on. Still, as for the AS, it has already been noticed by FRAUWALLNER that the AS, although using some of the central terms of that school, does for the most part not presuppose its distinct idealistic doctrines.[23] The term *cittamātra* is used, but only to describe the locus of the mental factors ("feeling and so on", *vedanādi*, AS 34,20) of the individual.[24] Even in the ASBh, the term *cittamātra* appears only two times.[25] Not anywhere in the AS are factors that are not perception explicitly denied.

Of course one may infer from statements such as the *ālayavijñāna* being pervaded (*paribhāvita*) by the imprints of *all skandhas* and *āyatanas* (AS 12,1f.) that those are ultimately *vijñāna* by nature, including those *āyatanas* that are the objects of sense perception. But such a statement is not made explicitly in the AS, and neither does the above doctrine necessarily imply that external objects, once manifest, remain purely mental phenomena.[26] So far, the AS does not go very far beyond the doctrines of other

---

[20] See GRIFFITHS, *On Being Mindless*, pp. 129-138 and SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 300, n. 227.

[21] SAKUMA, *Index*, p. 175. This count includes the occurrences of *ālayavijñāna* in compounds.

[22] See FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, pp. 329-331.

[23] See SCHMITHAUSEN, *External World*, pp. 10, 22-26, and id., "Pratyakṣam in the Abhidharmasamuccayaḥ", pp. 154-158. As for the term *niḥśarīra* (*ibid.*, p. 158, ad AS 41,19), I am not absolutely certain that the interpretation proposed in ASBh 53,19-54,3 matches the original intention of the AS (see SCHMITHAUSEN, *ibid.*, and notes 15, 16), while I cannot propose an alternative interpretation either. On Yogācāra idealism, see also YAMABE, "Self and Other", pp. 32 and 38.

[24] On *cittamātr[a]* at AS 34,20, see SCHMITHAUSEN, "Spiritual Practice and Philosophical Theory", p. 245: Feeling and so on do not indicate an *ātman*. They are associated (or dissociated) with mind (*citta*) only, and not with an *ātman*. On the doctrine of *cittamātra* in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, see id., "Literaturgeschichte", p. 820f., n. 46, id. "Spiritual Practice and Philosophical Theory", p. 238, and DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 174. The word *cittamātra* is also used at AKBh 145,3 in the description of feelings that arise due to the cognition of mental events (*manaḥsaṃsparśajā vedanā*): They are based on mind only (*cittamātra*), and not on material sense faculties. Similar to AS 34,20, *cittamātra* here does not indicate the ontological doctrine known by the same name, or that the objects of sense perception are mind in essence. In this AKBh passage it only means that no material objects are directly involved in a specific process.

[25] SAKUMA, *Index*, pp. 243, 483.

[26] See BRONKHORST's (*Karma and Teleology*, pp. 84-89) summary and interpretation of the pertinent passages in SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*. About the nature of phenomena in the MSg, the, *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* and the *Triṃśikābhāṣya*, NAGAO (*Mādhyamika and Yogācāra*, p. 143) states: "Both sentient beings and the world as a container are found, ultimately and truly, only in the *ālayavijñāna*", to which should be added the clarification that the *ālayavijñāna* was mostly

treatises which state that the external world is influenced by *karman.*

A hint at idealism is found in a description of meditation practice at AS 82,20-23. The AS quotes a sūtra–presumably a Mahāyānistic one, for the Buddha talks about the Buddhist practitioner as a Bodhisattva. In the course of the practice proclaimed, the practitioncer in meditation visualizes the image of an object of meditation. He then draws his attention to the fact that, although the object appears like an external object, it is in fact nothing but his own mind. And since he has understood that there is actually no object to be perceived, there is, as a matter of course, no subject perceiving. That leads him to a state of "no-perception" (**anupalambha.*[27] Still, what we do *not* find here is an explicit transfer of this understanding about the nature of visualized objects to *all* objects of perception.

The "three natures" (*trisvabhāva*) are mentioned two times, but in other passages, they do not appear in some contexts where one would expect a consistent classical Yogācāra text to mention them.[28] The classical *trisvabhāva* pattern appears at AS 40,17f.,[29] and within the section on Mahāyāna ("*vaipulya*") doctrine (AS 84,13-15=AS_G 35,17f.). At AS 31,6f. (=AS_G 29,1f.) a slightly different *trisvabhāva* pattern is discussed in rather non-Mahāyānistic terms. That pattern is also contained in the "Maitreya Chapter" of the *Prajñāpāramitā* sūtra in 25 000 verses (P 731).[30]

In a philosophically-minded Mahāyāna exposition of *karman* one might also expect the doctrine of "non-perception" (*anupalambha*) of agent and action, as it is mentioned, e.g., in the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra,* XV.5.[31] That doctrine is completely absent in the AS *karman* section,[32] and it is not even traceable in the respective ASBh explanations.[33] The definition of *śūnyatā* at AS 40,10-16 can be read in a purely

---

considered an individual, not collective, phenomenon, even though the phrasing of the treatises often resembles that of NAGAO. See my notes ad AS 55,11.

[27] See AS 82,18-23, SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 262, n. 100, *id.* "Spiritual Practice in Early Yogācāra", pp. 234f., 237-239, and LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, p. 581, n. 1. The same process seems to be meant in a verse at TrBh 42,5-8 (BUESCHER, *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya*, p. 132). See also MSg III.17 and *Xianyang shengjiao lun* 583b14f.

[28] See my notes ad AS 54,22-55,1.

[29] See SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 480, n. 1223, $AS_{t,D}$ 76b7f.

[30] See SCHMITHAUSEN, *op.cit.*, pp. 191-193, and DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 226, n. 157. On the development that lead to the occurrence of the "three characteristics" in the *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra*, see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 175.

[31] LÉVI, *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*, vol. 1, p. 98 and vol. 2, p. 175 (also GLASS, "Karma and Yogācāra", p. 20f.). Cf. NAGAO, *Mādhyamika and Yogācāra*, p. 10f.

[32] See, e.g., AS 53,13-14: "Five Aspects of the Ten Paths of Action", where the particpants in an action are described.

[33] See, e.g. ASBh 67,17-24, where various aspects of strong *karman* are discussed, without the slightest hint of a doctrine of emptiness or nonduality.

pre-Mahāyānistic sense and does not use any particularly innovative terminology.[34]

The Six Perfections (*ṣaṭpāramitā*) need not *necessarily* be mentioned within an exposition on *karman*, even in a Mahāyāna treatise, but still it is noteworthy there is not even an allusion to them in the whole section. Again, it is the Mahāyānistic *vaipulya* section (a part of the AS Dharmaviniścaya) where those are mentioned, in an explanation why the *pāramitāpiṭaka* of the Bodhisattvas is to be called "extensive" (*vaipulya*, AS 84,14-18=AS_G 35,1-4). ASBh 102,5-112,7 comments extensively on that relatively short AS passage and discusses the Six Perfections in detail. The doctrine of *tathāgatagarbha* and is completely absent in the AS, even though the soteriological *gotra*s may be alluded to in some passages (cf. ASBh 117,24: *śrāvakayāniko gotra°*, ASBh 121,18: *bodhisattva-gotra*).[35]

A good example for a relatively late doctrine in the AS is that of the Three Bodies of a Buddha (**trikāyāḥ*), which are mentioned in the Prāptiviniścaya section.[36] The doctrine of the Three Bodies does not appear in the YBh, even though precursors of that doctrine may be seen there.[37] It appears first in the MSA,[38] which clearly indicates that the final redaction of the AS must be later than the MSA.[39]

The AS mentions the Mahāyānist "nirvana without abiding" (*apratiṣṭhita-nirvāṇa*) in various passages (AS 22,21, 63,11, 87,14). Notably, the doctrine of *apratiṣṭhita-nirvāṇa* is absent in the YBh on the one hand, while it is an integral part of "Maitreya" treatises such as the MSA (IX.45, for example).[40] Thus, the above mentioned passages must have been written by someone who knew one or more of the "Maitreya" treatises.

ROSPATT (*Momentariness*, p. 85) discusses a list of six kinds of impermanence at AS 38,14-39,21 and comes to the conclusion that the AS list must be based on either a.) two similar lists in the *Xianyang shengjiao lun* (548a9-17) which is another Yogācāra outline ascribed to Asaṅga or b.) on a common predecessor, while it is highly improbable that the lists of the *Xianyang shengjiao lun* could be based on the AS.[41]

---

[34] See SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, pp. 190-192.

[35] On Yogācāra and *tathāgatagarbha*, see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 199.

[36] AS 94,11 (Sanskrit not preserved). For the Sanskrit term, see ASBh 123,19: *kāyatrayaviṣeśa*.

[37] DELEANU, *Mundane Path.*, p. 227, n. 171.

[38] See SCHMITHAUSEN, "Ratnagotravibhāga", p. 152, id. "Gestalt des Buddha", pp. 5-18, and NAKAMURA, "Erwachen", p. 14, and p. 94, n. 18, referring to MSA IX.60-66.

[39] This chronology, viz. that the MSA precedes the AS, basically seems to be confirmed by ROSPATT (*Momentariness*, pp. 150-152, n. 340). As ROSPATT demonstrates, the proof of momentariness in the AS (as well as in the ASBh) is more elaborate than that in the MSA.

[40] See AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 2f., and SCHMITHAUSEN, "Literaturgeschichte", p. 820.

[41] On AS 34,14, see also the addenda and corrigenda to the 2007 reprint of SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 703. SCHMITHAUSEN convincingly argues that the interpretation of the AS is clearly Mahāyānistic, but directed to a Śrāvaka audience.

In general, the doctrines found in the YBh exercised the strongest influence on the AS, which can also be seen in passages such as the list of twenty-four factors dissociated from mind,[42] or in the classification of the meditative attainment of cessation (*nirodhasamāpatti*) as a mere designation (*prajñapti*).[43]

On the typical Mahāyāna doctrine of *bodhicitta*, WANGCHUK (*Resolve*, p. 153) writes: "The AS does not mention the term *bodhicitta*, unlike the [MSg], which mentions it in the context of the thirty-two attributes of a [Bodhisattva]."[44] In the ASBh, in contrast, *bodhicitta* appears three times, and there are elaborations on the method to generate Bodhicitta (*cittotpāda*).[45]

To sum up, the AS clearly stands in a scholarly tradition close to the YBh, while the more innovative and controversial doctrines of the YBh as well as specific Mahāyāna doctrines appear rather sparsely, the latter mostly in the section on the "extensive" (*vaipulya*), i.e. Mahāyāna, tradition.[46] The section on *karman* is doctrinally almost free from specific Yogācāra or Mahāyāna doctrines. It contains nothing that, for example, a "Sautrāntika" following the AKBh would object to. But there is one notable exception: a list of the supernatural powers of the Bodhisattvas in the end of the section (AS 61,15-17). That shows, I assume, a certain strategy in composition. I am not sure whether the section on *karman* was composed by a Mahāyānist Yogācāra author, or whether it existed as part of a classical pre-Mahāyānist, pre-*ālayavijñāna* treatise, to which the Bodhisattva list was added only later. But in either case, the list appears in the very end of a hitherto non-Mahāyānist exposition, and one may wonder whether the intention behind that way of proceeding might be an attempt to make Mahāyāna and *Yogācāra* doctrines acceptable in wider circles.

---

[42] For the list of twenty-four *cittaviprayuktasaṃskāras* (AS 10,15-11,2, YBh 68,14-69,4), see BUESCHER, *Vijñānavāda*, p. 59, n. 1 and KRITZER, *Rebirth and Causation*, pp. 226-228.

[43] AS 11,2, see BUESCHER, *Vijñānavāda*, p. 58, n. 2.

[44] See MSg II.34.

[45] See WANGCHUK , *op.cit.*, p. 266.

[46] On Mahāyāna and the AS, see also SCHMITHAUSEN, "Pratyakṣam in the Abhidharma-samuccayaḥ", p. 158, and DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 182 and p. 229, n. 186.

The AS and the *Yogācārabhūmi*

In order to find the historical truth about the composition of the AS, it is worthwhile to look for possible analogies in that scholastic treatise the AS is most closely related to, namely the *Yogācārabhūmi*, equally ascribed to Asaṅga.[47] Although scholars formerly disagreed whether the *Yogācārabhūmi* (YBh) is to be considered a monograph or a compilation, it is now commonly accepted that it is primarily a collection of Abhidharma materials from a rather broad scholastic milieu that came to be known as the Yogācāra school.[48] As a collection, the voluminous YBh also contains doctrines that never gained wide popularity, neither in later works of the tradition, nor among other authors. The five *vastu*s, which are neither particularly Mahāyānistic nor idealist, seem to represent one of those teachings and they remain unmentioned in the AS.[49] I even assume that only a part of the Abhidharma materials that were produced in the Yogācāra tradition has been preserved.[50]

There is also little disagreement about the fact that different sections of the YBh reflect different strata in the history of Yogācāra thought.[51] Typical Mahāyāna ideas like the Bodhisattva ideal appear and gain increasing importance, and so do the concepts of a fundamentally defiled layer of consciousness (*kliṣṭaṃ manas*) and the *ālayavijñāna*, which (as most readers will know) are a subtle mental layers that continue even during unconscious states of mind.[52] By the time the YBh was completed in the form that is available today, those doctrines had surely become firmly included into the worldview of the YBh compiler (or compilers).[53] Like the AS, the YBh was considered an Abhidharma treatise that covers the doctrines of both, the Śrāvakayāna and the Mahāyāna. That is at

---

[47] On the textual history of the YBh (with references to the AS and ASBh), see also KRITZER, *Vasubandhu*, pp. xii-xx.

[48] See also BUESCHER, *Vijñānavāda*, p. 20.

[49] See KRAMER, *Fünf*-vastu-*Abschnitt*, p. 61, n. 60.

[50] In the Sarvāstivāda tradition, for example, various commentaries on the *Abhidharmahṛdaya* were lost. See RYŌSE, "*Abhidharmahṛdaya*", p. 27. On the situation in the case of canonical Abhidharma works, see also FRAUWALLNER, "Abhidharma-Studien III, IV", p. 103.

[51] DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 155) presents a hypothetical chart of several strata in the YBh, each reflecting a different doctrinal approach and a different historical epoch. See also e.g. DELHEY's (*Samāhitā Bhumiḥ*, pp. 21-25) analysis of the *Samāhitā Bhumiḥ*. Another good example of a major work that has grown over a longer period is the *Kathāvatthu*. See MCDERMOTT, "*Kathāvatthu* Kamma Debates", p. 424, n. 2.

[52] On classical Yogācāra concepts like the three natures (*trisvabhāva*), etc. in the YBh, see KRITZER, *Vasubandhu*, pp. xviii-xx.

[53] The influence of the so-called Mahīśāsaka school on the *Śrāvakabhūmi* has been a matter of discussion. In his recent study of that text, DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 161) comes to the conclusion that a predominance of Mahīśāsaka doctrines in the ŚrBh cannot be convincingly established. He rather agrees with SCHMITHAUSEN (*Udānavargā*, p. 119) in that certain doctrines of the Mahīśāsakas *may* have found their way into the YBh, just like those of the Dārṣṭāntikas, Sautrāntikas or the Sarvāstivādins.

least how the *Viniścayasaṃgrahaṇī*, a late, supplementary section of the YBh classifies it.[54]

A major turning point in the history of Yogācāra thought was the inclusion of the *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra* (SaNiSū) into the YBh, a Mahāyāna sūtra propagating idealism and the *ālayavijñāna*. Some scholars hold that it was originally composed in a scholarly group different from the YBh authors, and "YBh authors" should here mean those scholars the writings of whom were included into the YBh before the inclusion of the SaNiSū.[55] That, of course, is difficult to prove, but *if* it holds true, it would mean that doctrinally related groups of scholars could exist independently of each other. The author(s) of SaNiSū knew partly of the same doctrines as the YBh compilers, for it seems, for example, some doctrines from the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* can be traced in their work,[56] but maybe they got hold of the BoBhū (or related texts) separately, not as a part of the collection YBh.[57]

Nonetheless, it has also been claimed that the SaNiSū was written by the YBh authors (I would think, those who were in the middle of writing the VinSg). From my reading of DELEANU it seems that the main argument against that claim is the absence of SaNiSū thought in some earlier sections of the YBh where it would have fit in. Still, I believe no one would deny that a.) the SaNiSū *was* included into the YBh at some point, which means that some YBh author(s) came to agree with the thought expressed in the SaNiSū, even if it did not originate in their own tradition, and that b.) the YBh compiler(s) did *not* revise the whole YBh at that point to align it with those doctrines, which neither proves nor disproves that the VinSg authors wrote the SaNiSū. Not even the VinSg itself was revised to an extent where it would be coherent with all doctrines from the SaNiSū.[58] As for the SaNiSū itself, there is no evidence whatsoever that it existed in the complete form we know nowadays before the final redaction of the YBh.[59]

---

[54] $\text{VinSg}_{\text{t,D}}$ 188b3 classifies the YBh as a condensed (!) *mātṛkā* (*ma mo*, i.e. Abhidharma) treatise. As for the "vehicle" (*yāna*), that VinSg passage distinguishes between two canones (*sde snod*), that of the Śrāvakas and that of the Mahāyāna. For the "Mātṛkā", there is no such distinction, and only one treatise is mentioned: the YBh (*sa bcu bdun dang / bsdu ba bzhi*) seemingly for both vehicles (see also DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 46). The *Śrāvakabhūmi* is classified as a *mātṛkā* of all Śrāvaka treatises in its own colophon. See SCHMITHAUSEN, *Śrāvakabhūmi*, p. 472.

[55] See DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 173, referring to SCHMITHAUSEN, SUGURO and others.

[56] See BUESCHER, *Vijñānavāda*, p. 10.

[57] Actually, the AKBh author may have known of doctrines now contained in the YBh from texts or collections that looked quite different from the YBh as we know it now.

[58] That can be inferred from SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 14, BUESCHER, *Vijñānavāda*, p. 2, or KRAMER, *Fünf*-vastu-*Abschnitt*, pp. 5, 57. KRAMER discusses a section of the VinSg, the explanation of the five *vastus*, which has not been aligned with the respective explanations in the SaNiSū. According to KRAMER (*op.cit.*, p. 4), that section may even include fragments of materials older than the VinSg.

[59] Two parts of the SaNiSū were translated into Chinese separately between 443 and 453 CE. See AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 7.

From my superficial knowledge of the primary and secondary literature, it seems that there is as just as little compelling evidence *for* the SaNiSū being completed by the final redactor of the YBh as *against* such a theory. From the point of view of scholarly skill, the final redactor of YBh should have been creative and eloquent enough to complete the SaNiSū,[60] probably even more so if he stood in close contact with the tradition that brought forth Maitreya treatises such as the *Madhyāntavibhāga*.

The fact that the YBh was not thoroughly revised after the inclusion of the SaNiSū *may*–but this is highly speculative–support the assumption that the final editor of the YBh is identical to the author of the other Asaṅga works: he might have abstained from such a thorough revision in favour of other projects, i.e. an independent summary of the YBh (the *Xianyang shengjiao lun*), or a more elaborate argument for the *ālayavijñāna* and other new doctrines (the MSg), or a revision of the introductory textbook, the AS. By the inspiration he got from reading (or writing) the SaNiSū, he was driven to so many new projects that he decided to publish the YBh in the state it was (the AKBh author possibly found himself in the same situation at the same time). I have added the speculative construction of this scenario for the sake of lucidity, under the influence of the traditional biographies, while I am well aware that those legends themselves surely took the transmitted texts into account, trying to fit them into a coherent story–which is to say that if the textual situation somehow fits in with the traditional legend, that does not prove the legend right.

As for the VinSg, DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 180) hypothetically suggests that it was composed during a sixty-year period: thirty years before the inclusion of the SaNiSū, and thirty after that.[61] Although DELEANU's conclusions are based on thorough research, thirty years for the later parts of the VinSg seem far too long: within thirty years it should have been possible to revise the earlier parts of the VinSg thoroughly (if not the whole YBh) in order to align them with the new doctrines–especially if there is more than one scholar engaged in the process. In comparison: DELEANU proposes that Vasubandhu composed the whole AKBh single-handedly in less than ten years.[62]

Now, does that mean for the composition of the AS? I have above mentioned the possibility that the section on *karman* existed as part of a non-Mahāyānist Abhidharma treatise before the list of Bodhisattva powers was added, and indeed, I think it is not improbable that parts of the AS existed in the scholarly milieu of the YBh compilers before the final redaction of the YBh. That would imply that the AS partly grew

---

[60] See also BUESCHER, *Vijñānavāda*, p. 107, n. 1.

[61] Another important doctine of the VinSg is the concept of non-duality (*advaya*) which resembles that of the MSA. See AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśa*s*, p. 3, n. 12, referring to a study Kōitsu YOKOYAMA. See also my notes on "one flavour" ad ASBh 74,1-3.

[62] DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 194: between ca. 380 and 390. I am truly grateful to Deleanu for having stated his hypothesis in such plain terms. My objection about the VinSg has only been made possible by his clear statement and this is, I think, a good way to have a constructive discourse. The only deficit here is that my observation is purely commonsensical. And although it would be only fair if I postulate my own time estimate for the completion of the VinSg clearly, I can only guess that it should not have taken much longer than the composition of the AKBh.

simultaneously with the YBh. One indication for a gradual growth is of course the patchwork structure of the AS, which I will discuss in another section, below. The Satyaviniścaya section, for example, is an exposition of the Buddhadharma along the lines of the Four Noble Truths, which could very well stand as an Abhidharma treatise in its own right.

One may further wonder what was the necessity to compose the AS after the completion of the YBh. If there was a need for a compact introduction to Abhidharma, that need might have also existed *before* the YBh was published. While the YBh compilers were engaged in their research, they, or their colleagues must have used *some* text to teach basic Abhidharma.

What is undoubtedly clear is that the *final* redaction of the AS, as it was translated into Tibetan and Chinese, must have happened later than the MSA, as the doctrine of the Three Bodies of a Buddha is mentioned in the Prāptiviniścaya section.[63] Still, there is not much evidence about the origin of the AS, whether it was the summary of the legendary *Abhidharmasūtra*, [64] or composed on the basis of Mahīśāsaka doctrine,[65] or whether is, as I suspect, originated with one or more pre-Mahāyāna textbooks which grew simultaneously with the YBh, in the same scholastic circles the YBh authors belonged to.[66]

---

[63] See, e.g. KRAMER, *Fünf*-vastu-*Abschnitt*, p. 5, or DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 204, n. 29), who follows SCHMITHAUSEN ("Literaturgeschichte", p. 822, n. 48) in counting the AS among the works of the "Maitreya-Asaṅga complex", i.e. those works that show strong Mahāyāna leanings and an affinity to teachings from the YBh, i.e. the MSA, *Madhyāntavibhāga*, *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, MSg, and the *Xianyang shengjiao lun*. BUESCHER (*Vijñānavāda*, p. 144, n. 1) considers the AS a summary of the YBh. See also TOLA and DRAGONETTI, *Being As Consciousness*, p. xix. GRIFFITHS (*On Being Mindless*, p. 79) attributes to Asaṅga the MSg and the AS, "as well as whichever parts of the [YBh] can properly be attributed to him".

[64] Although it has been claimed that the AS is a compendium of the doctrines in the legendary *Abhidharmasūtra* (LÜ CHENG in Enc.Bud., s.v. *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, which seems to be based on ASBh 156,25f.), that claim is difficult do ascertain as long as we have only little knowledge of the *Abhidharmasūtra*. It is quoted in texts like the *Mahāyānasaṃgraha* (MSg) and the AS (see SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, pp. 11, 100, 260, n. 97, NAGAO, *Index to Asaṅga's Mahāyānasaṃgraha*, vol. 2, p. 148, and especially KEENAN, "Original Purity", p. 17, n. 17, as well as SILK, " Yogācāra Bhikṣu", p. 302, n. 132). The title, combining *abhidharma* and *sūtra*, is in any case remarkable.

[65] Asaṅga's Mahīśāsaka background, has been discussed Robert KRITZER (*Vasubandhu*, pp. xix). In this context, it is important do know that both FRAUWALLNER ("Abhidharma-Studien: I", p. 144) and CONZE (*Buddhist Thought in India*, p. 120) believe in Asaṅga's Mahīśāsaka roots. SCHMITHAUSEN (see KRITZER, *ibid.*) disapproves of the YBh being mainly based on Mahīśāsaka Abhidharma.

[66] My theory that the AS grew simultaneously with the YBh is of course not meant as an easy way to sneak out of *every* question on the relative chronology of the Yogācāra texts. There is a great need for serious in-depth research on that issue (see, for example, AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, pp. 8-11). Given the doctrinal and structural diversity of the AS, the simultaneous-growth theory is just one possible explanation for some phenomena I observed.

Such historical speculation is of course not fit to explain the absence of "classical" Yogācāra thought in many sections of the *final* redaction of the AS,[67] most strikingly the absence of the term *ālayavijñāna* in the *karman* section. Even though the AS as a whole is generally considered younger than the latest parts of the *Viniścayasaṃgrahaṇī*, it doctrinally often appears older than the *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra*. There were probably rhetorical reasons for this.

The Rhetorical Strategy of the AS

In his biography of Asaṅga, the Tibetan scholar Yongs 'dzin Ye shes rgyal mtshan (1713-1793) stresses the point that during Asaṅga's youth, there was much strife and disagreement among the Buddhist schools: the Śrāvakas were divided into many subschools, and some Śrāvaka teachers questioned the authenticity of the Mahāyāna scriptures.[68]

Whatever may be the historical truth about this, it is clear that Asaṅga was, more than a thousand years later, seen as a scholar who would bring various tradition together, and promote faith in the Mahāyāna sūtras. That image was surely supported by the comprehensiveness of the YBh, which includes a wealth of non-Mahāyānist doctrines, but also by the non-argumentative style of the AS.[69]

As an Abhidharma treatise, the AS is incomprehensible without oral or written

---

[67] By "classical Yogācāra", I loosely refer to the doctrine incorporating the *ālayavijñāna*, the three natures (*trisvabhāva*) and the view of the world as mind only (*cittamātra*). BUESCHER (*Vijñānavāda*, p. 4) uses the term "Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda" for the doctrine marked by that very "characteristic conceptual triplex", as he calls it. Still, as a compound **yogācāravijñānavāda* is not known to me from primary sources, I prefer the admittedly vague expression "classical Yogācāra", even though my understanding of that term differs from GRIFFITHS (*On Being Mindless*, pp. 76-79), as well as from MAY ("Idéaliste", p. 265). MAY speaks of a period of "Vijñānavāda classique" during which the great commentaries on earlier Yogācāra works were composed. I would consider those partly post-classical.

[68] YONGS 'DZIN YE SHES RGYAL MTSHAN, *Lam rim bla ma brgyud pa*, p. 74. DELHEY (*Samāhitā Bhūmiḥ*, p. 4, n. 3) has made the suggestion that the ascription of new doctrines to the *future* Buddha is made with the implication that those are the teachings of the *future*. I find that absolutely convincing. Whoever accepts that ascription implicitly accepts that those doctrines will be taught inevitably at the dawn of a new era of the Dharma, so why not adopt now the doctrines that one will adopt later in any case? In the same vein, the above narration about Asaṅga contains a significant parallel to the Maitreya myth: Asaṅga appears to end a period of decay and strife and reunites all Buddhists—in fact by expounding the doctrines of the future Buddha.

[69] In his AKBh, in contrast, Vasubandhu often engages in refutations of other's doctrines. As far as I understand HIRAKAWA (AKBh-Index-Skt, p. xxvf.), he even considers the criticism of the AKBh to be historically linked to Nāgārjuna's negative reasoning ("It might be that the characteristic of Sautrāntika is that it expresses its own standpoint through criticizing other doctrines. This method was a tradition of the Prajñapti, and then it was transformed into the method of Mahāyāna Buddhism". In contrast to Nāgārjuna's method, the AKBh is often affirmative, postulating, e.g., the concept of *cittapariṇāmaviśeṣa*–vague as it may be–to account for karmic retribution. On the definition of *viśeṣa* in the context of AKBh 477,17f., see KRAGH, *Action and Result*, p. 271, n. 440.

comment.[70] But within that framework, it mostly provides for smooth reading, the sidetracks to trifling scholastic debates being rare.[71] It is mostly a balanced but comprehensive presentation of important Abhidharma doctrines:[72] Its outline of *dhyāna* practice, for example, presupposes concepts from the *Śrāvakabhūmi* section of the YBh, critically adapting them for its exposition.[73]

Nonetheless, even with a commentary the AS is hardly fit to provide for a comprehensive introduction to the *innovative* thought of the YBh and the *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra*. That was much better achieved, for example, by the *Mahāyānasaṃgraha*. One of the reasons for that was probably that the AS followed the structure of more ancient Abhidharma treatises with a focus on categorization, classification (as in the delineation of the five *skandhas*) or on the systematic arrangement and systematization of sūtra passages (as in the exposition of the Four Noble Truths), and maybe those basic parts (on *skandhas* and the Truths) were even modelled so closely upon earlier predecessors that one could call that a revision. Whatever the historical events that led to the final redaction of the AS, it is quite striking, for example, that the powers of a Bodhisattva are mentioned only in the very end of the *karman* section, and one may wonder whether the absence of Mahāyāna doctrines in the earlier part of that section was not motivated by an attempt to make the Hīnayanists agree first, in a kind of Salami technique of persuasion, and to introduce Mahāyāna elements only stepwise. Or, as BUESCHER (*Vijñaptimātra*, p. 18) puts it in the case of the YBh, "ensuring a certain amount of receptivity before feeding the audience with small [...] doses of a completely new terminology." Such a strategy also might be hinted at by Jinaputra in his *Yogācārabhūmivyākhyā*. DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 230, n. 187) writes: "According to Jinaputra, one of the purposes why the *Yogācārabhūmi* had been expounded was to help the heretics and Hīnayāna believers renounce their perverted views and kindle faith in the Great Vehicle".[74]

It is of course difficult to ascertain the original intention of the AS author. The situation in the case of the AS (at least its *Satyaviniścaya* section) is partly similar to the three *Saṃgrahaṇīs* of the YBh, about which DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 170) states: "Of course, it could be argued that [the Mahāyānistic] elements may be late accretions in the formation of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, but I do not exclude the possibility that these

---

[70] That may support my theory that it was used as an Abhidharma primer in beginner's classes.

[71] See also SCHMITHAUSEN, *External World*, p. 52.

[72] See also SCHMITHAUSEN, "Literaturgeschichte", p. 822, n. 48, f.: "eine wohldurchdachte Verarbeitung der zur Verfügung stehenden Materialien"). YOSHIMOTO ("Busshitsu Gainen", p. 26) characterizes the AS as follows: The AS re-systemizes the various sūtras and śāstras of the Yogācāra tradition and adds new explanations to the conventional Abhidharma doctrines, thereby expanding the Yogācāra doctrines by means of an Abhidharmic method.

[73] See DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 256, and also p. 277, n. 121).

[74] Still, Jinaputra is not explicit on the persuasion strategy here. I know of no passages in the YBh that make concessions to non-Buddhist philosophies and I do not think that, e.g., the doctrine of *ālayavijñāna* should be understood in that way.

elements (or at least part of them) may have been there from the very beginning. In view of the inclusivistic and encyclopaedic atmosphere which seems to have been behind the compilation of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, the latter alternative is perfectly possible." To that it should be added that a conversion of Śrāvakas to the Mahāyāna by someone skilled in methods was surely considered wholesome at the time the *Saṃdhinirmocana* was composed. The inclusivistic spirit was surely there, but also some determination to persuade others who were less willing to enlarge the canon.

Still, I completely agree with DELEANU in that the *Saṃgrahaṇī* authors were *possibly* not very rigid about propagating Mahāyāna over Śrāvakayāna. Note that also several doctrines that do not appear in the Śrāvaka canons may have been completely acceptable to non-Mahāyānists, such as the Powers of a Bodhisattva or the hope for a future Buddha Maitreya. It was possibly quite common by the fourth century CE that traditional Buddhists engaged in practices and beliefs we nowadays identify with the Mahāyāna even if they did not consider themselves Mahāyānists.

Concerning the rhetorical strategy of the AS, what strongly speaks in favour of a prudent, step-by-step approach in the persuasion strategy of the AS is the mention of the miraculous powers of a Bodhisattva, a specific Mahāyāna doctrine, only in the very end of the *karman* section (which is, as stated above, a part of the Satyaviniścaya). The *ālayavijñāna*, on the other hand, is propagated openly quite in the beginning of the Lakṣaṇasamuccaya section (AS 3,4 etc.), which is surprising as it does not appear in the Satyaviniścaya at all. It seems that there were not only doctrinal differences between the Lakṣaṇasamuccaya and the Satyaviniścaya but also differences in rhetorical strategy. ROSPATT (*Momentariness*, p. 74) characterizes the approach of the AS as presenting "Mahāyāna teaching [...] in a way palatable to an Abhidharma-oriented audience", which is certainly accurate, with varying degrees of intensity between the various sections.

A Note on the Relative Chronology of the AS and the MSg

Both the AS and the MSg claim that the Full Comprehension (*abhisamaya*) of a Bodhisattva is different from that of a Śrāvaka, and both texts present a list of differences. Significantly, those lists differ in the different available translations: 1a) The Tibetan version of the AS ($AS_{t,P}$ 131b5-7, ad AS 94,7-10) names ten differences (*khyad par*), the seventh of which is the "difference in place and retinue". Neither is any sum total of those differences mentioned in the beginning of the list, nor are the single items numbered, but we find the word "difference" (*khyad par*) ten times, the seventh time after "place and retinue". The AS_t translation conforms to the respective passage at ASBh 123,10 (and $ASVy_{t,P}$ 321a2) where "place and retinue" are explained as one item, even though "place" means the purification of the Buddha field (*buddhakṣetrapariśodhana*) and "retinue" the encompassing of those beings to be tamed (*vineyajanopagrahaṇa*). "Place" and "retinue" appear similar at first sight, as if indicating a certain environment and the entourage one would naturally expect in that place, but they are here interpreted in a way which makes them only remotely related. 1b) The situation is different in case of Xuanzang's translation of the AS, where he counts eleven differences (AS_c 690c2: 略說有十一種) and lists "place" and "retinue" as separate items. Accordingly, we find the respective explanations split up at $ASVy_c$ 757b1-3 (建立差別者。謂善修治諸佛淨土故。眷屬差別者 謂攝受一切所化衆生爲眷屬故。). Following AS_c, PRADHAN has opted to include the numeral eleven in his Sanskrit text. 2a) MSg III.15 presents a similar, but slightly

different list. Again, the Tibetan translation lists ten differences, even counting them as ten ($MSg_{t,D}$ 25b6: *khyad par bcu°*). Here, the sixth item is "purification", which means that he has both "gives up the imprints of the defilements" (*nyon mongs pa'i bag chags spong ba*) and "purifies the Buddha field" (*sangs rgyas kyi zhing yongs su sbyong ba*), the latter aspect strongly resembling the first aspect of no. 6 in the AS_t list. Item no. 6 in MSg_t conforms to the Chinese translation by *(Dharma)gupta (T 1596, 298a1: 有十種差別, a5f.: 六清淨差別。煩惱斷及佛淨剎故). As the seventh difference in MSg_t, the Bodhisattva "has attained a mind [understanding the] equality of all beings with himself" (*sems can thams cad dang / bdag sems mnyam pa nyid thob pa*). That resembles no. 4 in the AS_t list, "accepting" (*khas len pa'i khyed par*), which is explained at ASBh 123,7 as "accepting all beings as equal to himself". 2b) The situation is different in XUANZANG's translation of the MSg, where he again lists eleven items, with "purification" as the sixth *and* seventh item (T 1594, 143b23: 六七) counting them, again, as eleven in total (143b18: 十一種差別). XUANZANG is not alone in his way of proceeding, for we find the same in Paramārtha's translation (T 1593, 123c22: 十一種差別, c27: 六七由清淨差別). 2c) Buddhaśānta's translation of the MSg strangely counts eleven items (T 1592, 105b10: 菩薩證入有十。一種, Taishō punctuation), while counting only ten in his list, in that aspect resembling MSg_t (105b13f.: 六者淨勝。煩惱習滅佛世界令清淨).[75]

So far, my depiction of this issue is mostly a rephrasing of a section in which AHN (*Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 10f.) argues against a view brought forth by Naoya FUNAHASHI, who proposes that the MSg list was originally tenfold, composed earlier than the AS list. The AS then contained the elevenfold list, and based on that, translators into Chinese interpreted the MSg list as elevenfold. After a thorough revision of the facts, I still do not see how FUNAHASHI explains it that the Tibetan translations of AS, ASBh and ASVy, as well as the Sanskrit text of the ASBh, quite clearly indicate a tenfold list.[76] I would like to add a few observations on this issue.

AHN 's argument reasonably implies that the numeral eleven in the three Chinese translations is some kind of *lectio difficilior* (the normal auspicious number being ten) and should be treated with the appropriate respect. It should therefore rather be considered the original MSg reading, for it is "hard to imagine"[77] that both Xuanzang and Buddhaśānta changed the sum total to eleven, even more so as Buddhaśānta actually counts ten items. I basically agree with that view, even though I see Buddhaśānta's version as the only evidence. AHN's argument presupposes that Xuanzang altered the AS and ASVy and *(Dharma)gupta the MSg. Alterations did thus happen, and it is just much more *probable* that Buddhaśānta had the numeral eleven before him, rather than him adding a penstroke in order to change "ten" to "eleven".

One striking point is that both elevenfold lists (AS_c and $MSg_{c,X}$) would contain only ten items if one were to conflate the "purification of the Buddha field" with another

---

75 Cf. AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 10.

76 FUNAHASHI, "Sengo", p. 31f.

77 AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 11: "schwer vorstellbar".

item. And in fact we find that item combined with different ones in the two tenfold lists: in the ASBh it is the explanation of item no. 7a, the "place", which is combined with 7b, the "retinue", which is explained as the "encompassing of those beings to be tamed" (the ASBh actually does not *count* the two as one item). As I have stated above, this explanation seems artificial and one would expect "place and retinue" to go together more smoothly. In MSg_t , this "purification of the Buddha field" is one of the two explanations of "purification" (item no. 6), to which the other, "purifying the imprints of the defilements" (6a) seems only remotely related. This *may* be an indication that *both* lists were originally tenfold (the number one would expect) and that the purification of the Buddha field is a later addition.

Still, the most linear explanation for the above constellation is that the MSg was completed first, including the elevenfold list. The AS was composed later, and the author, thinking that the MSg list was unsatisfactory, reworked the list to consist of only ten items.[78] What further speaks in favour of this chronology is the fact that the doctrine of the Three Bodies of a Buddha is mentioned at AS 94,11, immediately after the tenfold list. That doctrine is absent in the MSg and thus the AS passage seems to be much younger.

In another passage (AS 87,12-16), we find a similar list of ten qualities of a "Mahāyānika" person. The list describes the career of a Bodhisattva in a mostly chronological order: As the first item, a Bodhisattva is either certainly a Bodhisattva by nature (*byang chub sems dpa'i chos nyid nges pa*) or he is not [yet] certain (item no. 1). According to ASBh 117,24, this alludes to his soteriological *gotra*. Such a person brings forth a strong aspiration (*smon lam*) to liberate all beings (3) and wishes for the *apratiṣṭhita-nirvāṇa* (4), while neither the purification of the defilements (or their imprints) is mentioned, nor his recognition of the equality of others with himself or his assembling those to be tamed. He brings all beings to ripening (7) and purifies the Buddha field (8) and finally attains perfect awakening (*yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub*, 10). As a whole, this list appears more balanced, narrative and thus more advanced than the lists discussed above. The list is rather self-explanatory so that there are only few comments in the ASBh—a stylistic difference from the list at AS 94,7-10 and a possible indication that it was written quite late in the development of the AS.

One may wonder why the AS author included the reworked MSg list even after he had already written a much more coherent tenfold list at AS 87,12-16. The most natural answer is that he wanted to establish a better interpretation of the unsatisfactory MSg list. Still, the result he produced was not overwhelmingly coherent either, with the divergent interpretations of "place" and "retinue". This is an irritating point for which I can present no definitive interpretation, but I think there is at least a possibility AS 94,7-10 did not include the "purification of the Buddha field" when it was first taught in public, and the same applies for the MSg list (which may then have led to some varying interpretations among the earlier and later disciples of the author).

Those are just speculations, but what is clear is that the interpretation of the

---

[78] SUGURO, *Shokiyuishikishisō*, p. 546, quoted in FUNAHASHI, "Sengo", p. 31.

MSg and the AS 94,7-10 lists as tenfold did not gain absolute prominence in the later tradition. Xuanzang, at least, adhered to the elevenfold interpretation, and we also find a modified AS 94,7-10/ASBh list in the *Saṃskṛtāsaṃskṛtaviniścaya* by Daśabalaśrīmitra, which counts eleven items (D 3897, 264a2: *khyad par bcu gcig*, 264a6: *sangs rgyas kyi zhing yongs su dag par byed pas gnas kyi khyad par ro // gdul bya'i skye bo nye bar 'dzin pas 'khor gyi khyad par ro //*).

Schools and Their Limits

Traditional sources often tend to present a set of clear-cut doctrinal "schools" in Indian Buddhism. This holds true for, for example, the *Kathāvatthu* commentary, as well as Tibetan doxography. But modern critical scholarship questions most of those rigid classifications. James MCDERMOTT ("*Kathāvatthu* Kamma Debates", p. 424, n. 1), for example, reminds us in the context of the *Kathāvatthu*: "It must be remembered, however, that at the time at which the *Kathāvatthu* was compiled, Buddhist thought need not have been categorized in terms of well-defined philosophical schools as these designations might imply. Rather, for our purposes the school names will be taken merely as handy designations for the proponents of the views specifically under consideration." About the Sarvāstivāda, KIMURA Taiken stated already in 1937 that the *Prajñaptiśāstra* might have originated in a non-sectarian environment,[79] while SKILLING (*Mahāsūtras*, vol. 2, p. 100), presents various models of possible relations between "Sarvāstivāda" and "Mūlasarvāstivāda".[80]

A similar situation prevails for the Sautrāntika school, as there is hardly any compelling evidence for a unified Sautrāntika tradition before the AKBh. As for the AKBh author, Akira HIRAKAWA (*Indian Buddhism*, p. 203) considers it possible "that Vasubandhu was drawing on a variety of scholastic traditions when he wrote the *Abhidharmakośa*."[81] Although some alleged students of Vasubandhu continued the Sautrāntika tradition in so far as they wrote treatises and commentaries based on the AKBh worldview, they clearly stood under the influence of Yogācāra and Mahāyāna thought.[82] Also Junshō KATŌ, one of the leading scholars in the field, speaks of the Sautrāntika tradition not without reservations: in an encyclopaedia entry on the Sautrāntikas, KATŌ mentions doubts as to whether the "Sautrāntika" denomination ever

---

[79] See WILLEMEN, DESSEIN and COX, *Sarvāstivāda*, p. 196.

[80] *If*, which is not certain, "Sarvāstivāda" and "Mūlasarvāstivāda" actually refer to two groups of the same provenance, I would, judging only from the names, assume that "Mūlasarvāstivāda" is the splinter group and not the original mainstream. A mainstream group can rather be expected to stick to its transmitted name.

[81] *Abhidharmakośa* may here loosely refer to both the AK and the AKBh (a translation of Japanese 俱舍論).

[82] The *pramāṇa* luminaries Dignāga and Dharmakīrti, for example, are counted as belonging to the Sems-tsam-pa (i.e. Cittamātra) tradition in an 18th century Tibetan doxographical treatise. See HOPKINS, "Doxography", p. 175f. For a different classification of Yogācāra currents, see, e.g., MIMAKI, *Blo gsal grub mtha'*, p. 105. See also DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 214f., n. 69, for a rather affirmative discussion of the Sautrāntika school.

held any monasteries of its own. According to him, the Sautrāntikas can be considered a school-like phenomenon[83] in so far as they corrected the contradictions of the Sarvāstivāda doctrine. That they were considered a "school" along with the Sarvāstivāda, Madhyamaka, and Yogācāra, KATŌ says, is rather the view of later non-Buddhist authors.[84]

For the AS and the YBh, Mudagamuwe MAITHRIMURTHI (*Vier* apramāṇas, p. 187, n. 3) postulates a "common fund" of Abhidharma thought at which the authors of those works may have participated, just like the *Sarvāstivāda* authors. The existence of a clearly defined Yogācāra school has been questioned already by Guiseppe TUCCI,[85] and the diversity of the Yogācāra teachings has been acknowledged, e.g., by Shinjō SUGURO (*Shokiyuishikishisō*, p. 4), who turns against the view that "the Yogācāra school originally possessed a single body of teachings, after which a number of branches sprouted due to differing interpretations of this basic teaching." SUGURO holds that "the treatises of Maitreya, Asaṅga, and Vasubandhu ... include a whole spectrum of teachings", compared to which the commentaries on those works appear relatively homogenous. And Gregory SCHOPEN, even states that "The Mahāyāna produced some very impressive, even mind-boggling, "philosophical" systems, like those lumped together under the heading Yogācāra."[86] Furthermore, the term *yogācāra* does not always refer to a scholastic current, but sometimes more loosely to Buddhist "practitioners of *yoga*", who focus on the contemplative aspects of Buddhism.[87]

In a more general sense, KRAGH (*Action and Result*, p. 27) cautions his readers that "precise sectarian labels should be treated with suspicion and may rather reflect later attempts to systematise the earlier profusion of views into neatly defined sectarian compartments, such as Saṃmitīya, Sautrāntika, etc." But even the principles according to which those later attempts were made are far from being transparent, for Collett COX reminds us with regard to doxographical and historical primary sources, that it is not "clear whether the notion of what constituted a sect or school remained consistent in sources of different periods."[88]

There is no thus no commonly accepted definition of a "school" in Indian

---

[83] 学派的存在であったと思われる. KATŌ here possibly presupposes the definition of a "school" as a Vinaya/monastic tradition, even though he uses the term 学派. The term 部派, normally used in Buddhist studies, is probably too special for a popular encyclopedia entry. I will address Vinaya schools below.

[84] KATŌ in *Sekai dai hyakka jiten*, 2nd electronic ed., s.v. *kyōryōbu*.

[85] Already in 1929, TUCCI ("Buddhist Logic before Diṅnāga", p. 454) observed that "[T]he so-called Yogācāra school [was] started by Asaṅga and developed by Vasubandhu. The teaching of this school, in its dogmatical structure, seems to be more related to the Sautrāntika doctrines than to the ontological theories expounded in the Laṅkāvatāra or in the Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda."

[86] Gregory SCHOPEN in BUSWELL, ed., *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, s.v. Mahāyāna.

[87] See DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 158 and p. 271, n. 50.

[88] COX in BUSWELL, ed., *Encylopedia of Buddhism*, s.v. "Mainstream Buddhist Schools."

Buddhism, but in order to classify the ancient treatises into various groups, it would be helpful to redefine schools in a way acceptable to modern scholarship. One pragmatic solution was proposed by Lambert SCHMITHAUSEN ("Schulzugehörigkeit", p. 305), focusing on canonical and post-canonical materials. In this context, he defines a "school" as being primarily "a monastic unit that accepts one- and the same version of the canon, especially the Vinaya."[89] That definition clearly refers to monastic groups, the so-called *nikāyas*, and not to philosophical schools of thought. Those are often, but not always, identical. For example a Theravāda Bhikkhu can normally be expected follow Theravāda Abhidhamma and not any other, while it seems that by the fourth century CE scholars changed their views without changing their ordination lineage.[90] Many Vinaya traditions are clearly definable, while in other cases it is not possible to find out which Vinaya school a Vinaya text stems from (or, which Vinaya school goes back to it).[91] Whether or not that points to a certain fluidity of Vinaya traditions at that time, the available data only partly permit the linking of Vinaya traditions to scholastic traditions.

In the case of the AS, we simply do not know in which Vinaya tradition the author (/final redactor) was originally ordained. Traditional hagiography claims that Asaṅga was ordained as a Mahīśāsaka monk, but even if that was so, did he stick to the Mahīśāsaka canon and the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya rituals for his whole life? Similarly, we do not know which Vinaya lineage the authors of the various YBh sections belonged to. There can be some inferences from the canonical material they quote. But the canon used need not be necessarily be the canon of an author's original ordination lineage, especially in a monastic environment where monks of several Vinaya lineages live together, or with widely travelled scholars.

Most *nikāyas* probably forbade their monks to perform their Vinaya rituals together with monks of other groups and even in the later universities the monks are reported to have performed their rituals separately. Still, Faxian relates how in the early fifth century travelling monks were welomed hostitably in most Buddhist monasteries.[92] Even if in such cases the confession ceremony was not performed together, living together for a period of time was obviously possible. There is even a custom in Śrī Laṅka which allows the ordination in a second lineage for a travelling monk without him losing his original tradition,[93] but that seems only to apply to Theravāda monks.

I recently learned that some contemporary Bhikṣuṇīs from the Tibetan tradition, even after they were ordained in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya, were allowed to perform Vinaya rituals according to the Tibetan monastic handbooks which are based on the

---

[89] See also ENOMOTO, "Mūlasarvāstivādin", p. 248f., KIEFFER-PÜTZ, "Buddhistische Gemeinde", p. 289.

[90] See also KIEFFER-PÜTZ, "Buddhistische Gemeinde", p. 289. Xuanzang also uses the expression "Mahāyāna-Sthavira" which could refer to monks ordained in the Sthavira tradition but adhering to Mahāyāna views (*ibid.*, p. 290).

[91] See SCHMITHAUSEN, "Sentience of Plants", p. 38.

[92] See also KIEFFER-PÜTZ, "Buddhistische Gemeinde", p. 290.

[93] KIEFFER-PÜTZ, "Buddhistische Gemeinde", p. 289.

Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya.[94] That appears quite surprising at first, but it is a bit less so if we take Xuanzang's travelogue into account, according to which the Dharmaguptakas were considered one of the subgroups of Mūlasarvāstivāda (another being Mahīśāsaka) by the time Xuanzang visited India.[95]

As for the Yogācāra school (of dogma), I think it is possible to see several lines of development that start from treatises like the *Śrāvakabhūmi* or the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, and another line that comes from Maitreya treatises such as the *Madhyāntavibhāga*. Those and other influences lead up to the completion of the *Viniścayasaṃgrahanī*, texts like the MSg or the Mahāyāna commentaries ascribed to Vasubandhu, and the later works by Dharmapāla or Xuanzang. Those developments define the axis of a scholarly field, and the limits of that field may be delineated by such treatises as the *Uttaratantra*, the possible Mahīśāsaka doctrines in YBh and AS, by the Yogācāra-inclined "Sautrāntika" of Vasubandhu, up to developments out of India, such as the gZhan-stong "Madhyamaka" of Dol po pa and its adaptation Kong sprul in the nineteenth century.[96] Scholarly fields may well overlap, but still it is possible to arrive at some definition based on doctrinal criteria. When I speak of a Yogācāra school for reasons of classification, I do so under the influence of traditional doxographical literature, while it is in fact not clear which Buddhist authors considered themselves members of an Abhidharma school by that name.[97]

A good example of how close various scholarly groups were in contact in the fourth century is a quite astonishing parallel between the ASBh and the **Nyāyānusāra* which ROSPATT (*Momentariness*, p. 151, n. 340) has identified. How could such a parallel come about? Later traditional biographies claim that Saṅghabhadra, author of **Nyāyānusāra* and the Kośakāra's former teacher, came to Magadha where his former disciple Vasubandhu had abandoned his Sarvāstivāda convictions.[98] What is beyond doubt is that the **Nyāyānusāra* author somehow got hold of the AKBh. Thus having access to scriptures from scholars close to the Yogācāra circles, he may have aquired the ASBh, some precursor of it, or even received oral explanations on the AS in the course of his enquiries. At that point in history, the worlds of the Sarvāstivādins and of those known as Yogācāras were not so far apart.

---

94 A Tibetan monastery follows a code of regulations (*bca' yig*), often written by a former or the present abbot. For recitation, a standard set of texts is used and, as far as I know, the Dharmaguptaka Bhikṣunīs perform at least part of the Vinaya rituals together with the Mūlasarvāstivāda novices.

95 KIEFFER-PÜTZ, "Buddhistische Gemeinde", p. 301.

96 My understanding of a scholarly field is based on CSIKSZENTMIHALY, *Creativity*, p. 28.

97 See SILK, " Yogācāra Bhikṣu", p. 273, n. 30 and p. 306, and SCHMITHAUSEN, "Spiritual Practice in Early Yogācāra", p. 213.

98 See CHIMPA and CHATTOPADHYAYA, *Tāranātha's History*, p. 174f.

Authorship of the Abhidharmasamuccaya

Authorship and Date

The *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (AS) is traditionally held to be a work by Asaṅga (fourth century),[99] but the question of its authorship cannot be answered with absolute certainty.[100] Not only are traditional ascriptions of Indian Buddhist texts to be regarded with some scepticism, in addition, what SCHMITHAUSEN has called "compilatory features" can hardly be ignored when reading through the text.[101] A Chinese Yogācāra treatise even states: "That treatise was written by Asaṅga and others".[102]

By pointing to the "compilatory features" of the AS, I do not wish to say that it is, as a whole, a *compilation*, nor that I have found compelling evidence for or against such a

---

[99] DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 196) hypothetically proposes the dates of 330-405 for Asaṅga. Cf. KRITZER (*Vasubandhu*, p. xviii): "Asaṅga's lifetime [is] usually thought to span the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century", SCHMITHAUSEN ("Versenkungspraxis", p. 60): "4. od. 5. Jh. n. Chr.", and KEENAN ("Asaṅga", p. 32): "ca. 320 - ca. 390". GRIFFITHS (*On Being Mindless*, p. 174, n. 7), assumes a life span from the end of the fourth to the middle of the fifth centuries. Formerly, FRAUWALLNER'S (*Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 326) dating of ca. 315-390, was generally followed, e.g., by MIMAKI, MORIYAMA, and TOMABECHI, trans., *Tsonkapa*, p. 176, n. 6, and MATHES, *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, p. 15. One of the recent surveys on the life of Asaṅga is POWERS, *Two Commentaries*, pp. 22-27.

[100] See KRITZER, *Rebirth and Causation*, pp. 13-18.

[101] See KRITZER, *Rebirth and Causation*, p. 5f. I do of course presuppose that the work of an author is always compilatory to some extent. This has been made clear by FOUCAULT (*Ordre du discours*, pp. 28-30) and it is now generally accepted in Buddhist studies (see SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 268f., n. 124, KRAGH, *Action and Result*, p. 26f., and DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 201). I may venture to speak of "compilatory features" in cases where passages are taken over literally without indication of the source, or when passages are added that give a whole new turn to a formerly consistent passage. That definition is of course still unsatisfactory and preliminary. Such compilatory features may be sometimes less obvious, sometimes more, as in the case of Dharmaśrī's *Abhidharmahṛdaya* where FRAUWALLNER (*Studies in Abhidharma*, p. 139) sees a cut-and-paste method ("mit Schere und Kleister gearbeitet", *id.*, "Abhidharma-Studien: I", p. 25). In a more general sense, KRAMER (*Fünf*-vastu-*Abschnitt*, p. 22) has noticed that the thought *Viniścayasaṃgrahaṇī*, though it may well be the expression of a single tradition, does not appear to be completely consistent.

Abhidharma itself began as a genre reorganizing the transmitted knowledge if the sūtras in the form of *mātṛkā*s. As for the early Yogācāra literature, titles like *Abhidharma<u>samuccaya</u>*, the *Mahāyāna<u>saṃgraha</u>*, or *Viniścaya<u>saṃgrahaṇī</u>*, tell us of the attempt to condense the ancient lore, while "Asaṅga" characterizes the *Xianyang shengjiao lun* as his summary of the YBh in his opening verses. Also the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga* is called a condensed teaching (*bstan pa bsdu ba*), and two other "Maitreya" treatises, the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* and the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* mainly condense and reorganize older materials. Later commentators then elaborated upon the summaries or wrote new summaries, such as JI's summary of the YBh (on which see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 251).

[102] T 1832, 666b3: 此論本是無著等造.

claim. Still, the fact that the Viniścayasamuccaya only fits rather strangely into the outline given in the beginning of the Lakṣaṇasamuccaya, or the absence of the term *ālayavijñāna* in the Viniścayasamuccaya, are just two of the many hints to a rather eventful textual history.

As a rule, I tend to regard all traditional ascriptions of treatises to famous Indian masters with scepticism unless there is further evidence. In the case of the AS, the parallels and similarities to the YBh, the *Xianyang shengjiao lun*, and the MSg are sufficient to say that it came about in the same scholastic scene that brought about those text, but I do not know of any hard fact that would *prove* the authorship of Asaṅga. There were surely several Abhidharma masters in the scholastic millieu Asaṅga belonged to who were capable of producing a text like the AS, and additionally the author may have relied heavily on transmitted materials for some sections.

The AS was even ascribed to Maitreya himself. BU STON relates that Śāntipa (i.e. Ratnākaraśānti, ca. 1000 CE) claimed that the AS, too, was composed (*mdzad*) by Maitreya, a view which BU STON rejects, holding instead that only the five Dharmas of Maitreya are to be considered such, while it was Asaṅga who composed the *Yogācārabhūmi* after he had returned from Maitreya's divine realm. Asaṅga then composed the AS and the *Mahāyānasaṃgraha* as summaries of the YBh.[103]

Concerning the biography of Asaṅga in contemporary research, DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 194) proposes hypothetically that Asaṅga studied with his master Maitreya (a man who had the same name as the future Buddha) around 350 and took part in editorial work on the YBh, which included writing the later parts of the VinSg. The *édition définitive* of the YBh was submitted around 380, which was approximately the time Asaṅga started teaching his younger brother Vasubandhu.

Not many conclusions for the question of authorship can be drawn from the **language** used in the AS. It is basically classical scholarly Sanskrit, in so far similar to the AKBh or to most parts of the YBh.[104] The AS naturally contains many technical terms that are peculiar to Buddhist literature, without the language of those telling us much about the date of the text.[105] As far as syntax and non-technical vocabulary are concerned, I cannot point to anything strikingly Buddhist, perhaps with the exception of the occasional *tadyathā*, which I consider a procedural technical term. In style and syntactical complexity, nonetheless, the AS often seems much less refined than the ASBh, which is stylistically closer to the AKBh and TrBh. Those last three treatises explain to

---

[103] See BU STON, *Chos kyi 'byung gnas*, fol. 104b4-6, and OBERMILLER, *History of Buddhism*, vol. 2, p. 139f. Also the Chinese commentator Tao-lun held that the YBh was an *abhidharmapiṭaka* taught by Maitreya (see DELHEY, *Samāhitā Bhūmiḥ*, p. 3, n. 2). On the ascription of various works to Maitreya, see SUGURO, *Shokiyuishikishisō*, pp. 5-10.

[104] Within the YBh, the ŚrBh, for example, is rich in middle-indic absolutive forms, as I was kindly informed by Lambert SCHMITHAUSEN.

[105] See also WANGCHUK, *Resolve*, p. 150: "A terminological archaism need not necessarily correspond to the age of a text, for even a recent work may contain very archaic terms and conservative ideas".

the reader what they mean in full sentences and thus appear a bit more colloquial than the extremely dense and taciturn AS. Still, I have the impression that some passages in the AS are quite self-explanatory and explicit (such as the list of ten qualities of a "Mahāyānika" person at AS 87,12-16) and I suspect that many of those were written late in the development of the AS.

Asaṅga's Brother and the Kośakāra

Closely linked to the biography of Asaṅga is the question whether the author of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* is actually identical with Asaṅga's brother. Already traditional scholarship (namely BU STON) had recognized contradictions related to this issue,[106] and those were noted in western scholarship already by the late 19th century.[107] In 1951 FRAUWALLNER published his controversial monograph *On the Date of the Buddhist Master of the Law Vasubandhu*, in which he proposed that there were actually two Vasubandhus: Asaṅga's brother, the elder Vasubandhu, and the author of the Abhidharmakośa, the younger Vasubandhu. The Vasubandhu question has subsequently, lead to two major fractions:[108] those who think that Asaṅga's brother was identical with the Kośa author,[109] and those who consider FRAUWALLNER's two-Vasubandhu theory more probable.[110] Among the reasons for the latter assumption are the stylistic and doctrinal discrepancies between works like the AKBh, *Karmasiddhi*, and so on, on the one hand, and Vasubandhu's extensive commentaries on Mahāyāna sūtras and the works of Maitreya, on the other. I think it is very well possible that those two groups of texts were written by two different persons. Still, looking at doctrinal standpoints exclusively, there are already major discrepancies between, say, the AK and the AKBh, left alone the *Karmasiddhi*.

In the AKBh, the word "previous teachers" (*pūrvācāryāḥ*) often refers to Yogācāra thought,[111] or, more precisely, thought we know from Yogācāra treatises such as the YBh. That alone does not prove that those *pūrvācāryas* actually belonged to the

---

[106] See, e.g. MARTIN, "Tibetan Teaching Tradition of the *Mngon pa kun btus*", p. 338.

[107] See BUESCHER, *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya*, p. 1, n. 1.

[108] The ensuing discussion was summarized by Marek MEJOR in 1991. See MEJOR, *Abhidharmakośa and the Commentaries*, pp. 3-18, 42-49. See also KRITZER, *Vasubandhu*, pp. xxii-xxvi, WILLIAMS, *Mahāyāna Buddhism*, p. 279, n.1, and MARTIN, "Tibetan Teaching Transmission of the *Mngon pa kun btus*", p. 337f.

[109] See KRITZER, *Vasubandhu*, p. xxv, referring to the writings of JAINI, HAKAMAYA, HARADA, and others.

[110] See, e.g., SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 262f., n. 101,. WANGCHUK, *Resolve*, p. 254, MATHES, *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, pp. 25-28, PAHLKE, *Vijñāna-Abschnitt des Pañcaskandhaka*, pp. 10-12, LORENZ, *Indische Denker*, pp. 106-109. BUESCHER (*Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya*, p. vii, n. 2) agrees with SCHMITHAUSEN who, in course of research on Vasubandhu and the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*, came to the conclusion that FRAUWALLNER's date of 400-480 C.E. for Vasubandhu the Kośakāra must be too late.

[111] MAITHRIMURTHI, *Vier* apramāṇas, p. 188, see also DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 159, referring to KRITZER, *Vasubandhu*, and others.

Yogācāra school (and not some precursor of it), that the AKBh author knew their doctrines from the YBh (in the arrangement we know now, or some precursor of it), or that he considered himself a follower of the Mahāyāna. But all that appears quite probable, as we see the AKBh author go in that direction in other works ascribed to him, such as *Triṃśikā*, *Viṃśatikā* and *Karmasiddhi*. Robert KRITZER has compared the doctrines of the AKBh and the YBh, coming to the conclusion that Vasubandhu relied heavily on the YBh when he revised his Sarvāstivāda convictions in the AKBh .[112] At the risk being overly suspicious, the ascription of *any* work to Vasubandhu is not more than a model with a higher or lower probability to me. As a model with a relatively high probability, I find KRITZER's explanation consistent, especially as the *Pratītyasamutpādavyākhyā*, equally ascribed to Vasubandhu, refers to the YBh.[113]

One of the factors that have complicated research on this issue is the fact that Vasubandhu, in his *Karmasiddhi*, propagates the *ālayavijñāna* in sections that he claims to explain the doctrine of the "Sautrāntika",[114] the school he normally agrees with in his AKBh. The sūtra he quotes in order to establish the *ālayavijñāna* is the *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra*, which he even explicitly designates as a *mahāyānasūtra* ($\text{KSi}_{t,P}$ 164b7; T 1609, 784c24). Here, the term "Sautrāntika" gets a whole new meaning: indeed, Vasubandhu approach is a Sautrāntika one in so far as he relies on sūtras rather than the Abhidharma treatises of the Sarvāstivādins,[115] but the sūtra he quotes was clearly produced much later than the canon of the Sarvāstivādins, and in difference to those sūtras, the *Saṃdhinirmocana* was allegedly taught by the Buddha in a heavenly realm. [116] A recent contribution to this discussion is DELEANU's (*Mundane Path*, p. 234, n. 206) analysis of the historical sources. It has led him to the conclusion that those do not contain sufficient evidence for Frauwallner's two-Vasubandhu theory. DELEANU carefully limits this however, to the *historical* sources, while does not exclude that an analysis of the works ascribed to Vasubandhu may yield different results. There may well be doctrinal evidence to the effect that some of the Mahāyāna commentaries were wrongly ascribed to the Kośakāra.[117] DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 194) proposes hypothetically

---

[112] See KRITZER, *Vasubandhu*, p. xxx.

[113] See P 5495, fols. *chi* 5b1, 13a1, 25b4, and DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 186 and p. 232f., n. 200.

[114] See LAMOTTE, "Traité de l'acte", p. 164, KRITZER, *Vasubandhu*, p. xxviiif., GLASS, "Karma and Yogācāra", p. 9f, and MCDERMOTT, "Karma and Rebirth", p. 185.

[115] See COX in BUSWELL, ed., *Encylopedia of Buddhism*, s.v. "Mainstream Buddhist Schools."

[116] LAMOTTE ("Traité de l'acte", p. 175) brings forth a list of arguments against Bu ston's claim that the KSi is a treatise of the Vijñānavāda tradition. I find Bu ston's standpoint more convincing: Although the KSi author mostly conforms to the AKBh and calls his own position "Sautrāntika", he ultimately believes in the *ālayavijñāna* and accepts the *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra* as scriptural authority.

[117] DELHEY (*Samāhitā Būmiḥ*, p. 12f.) has recently carefully suggested that, if there are reasons to date the Kośakāra earlier than proposed by Frauwallner, his estimate for the date of the elder Vasubandhu may have to be adapted, too. Many of those alterations, surely justified, could have far-reaching implications for the dating of the younger Vasubandu's brother and his works. Since I

that Asaṅga's brother Vasubandhu composed the AKBh between ca. 380 and 390.

Even though the issue has been around since 1951, the last decades unfortunately saw only few substantial, fact-finding enquiries. DELEANU's analysis has now taken the discussion one important step further, and I can only add two minor details to it:

1.) According to TĀRANĀTHA's chronicle, Vasubandhu was born one year after his elder brother Asaṅga took ordination (*rab tu byung ba*). DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 244, n. 266) proposes that that refers to the Bhikṣu ordination (which is not allowed before the age of 19, 二十歲, cf. DELEANU, *ibid.*), even though he is aware that the expression *rab tu byung ba* can also stand for monastic ordination in the broadest sense (see AS 57,7-8). I tend to think that *rab tu byung ba* here rather indicates initial admission to the monastery. TĀRANĀTHA says that Asaṅga was first ordained (I would say, as a novice, *rab tu 'byung*), then served the monastic preceptor (*mkhan po*) and others for a year (*lo gcig tu mdzad nas*), after which he received the full ordination (*bsnyen par rdzogs nas*), and then read and memorized the texts for five years (*lo lnga'i bar du*). Vasubandhu was born in the year after Asaṅga had entered the monastery (*rab tu byung ba'i phyi de'i lor*).[118] In another passage, TĀRANĀTHA claims that Vasubandhu is said to have survived Asaṅga by about (*tsam*) twenty-five years,[119] which supports the idea that he was about twenty years younger.

2.) A traditional Tibetan interpretation styles Vasubandhu a contemporary of the Tibetan king Lha tho tho ri gnyan btsan.[120] It is true that this account represents "no contemporary evidence" (FRAUWALLNER, *Vasubandhu*, p. 64). Still, although it is a later calculation, it is worth mentioning that STEIN's (*Tibetan Civilization*, p. 51f.) hypothetical birth date for Lha tho tho ri, 367 A.D., fits in well with DELEANU's (*Mundane Path*, p. 194) estimate of ca. 350-430 for Vasubandhu.[121]

I personally think the opinion of a brilliant Indologist like Frauwallner should not be dismissed if not properly refuted. Often enough has it been shown that traditional historiography does not withstand an enquiry with modern methods. There is thus a demand for a stylistic and doctrinal analysis of the "Vasubandhu" works in order to find hard facts that would support one or the other hypothesis. And even if ultimate clarity cannot be reached, more detailled enquiry will surely contribute to a better understanding of that corpus as such. Until such a study appears, I, for lack of better knowledge, tend to abstain from any judgement.

Authorship of the Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya and

---

am, in the course of this thesis, unable to conduct a systematic assessment that would justify such a modification, I present the dating of Asaṅga and his works according to the current state of the art.

118 See CHIMPA and CHATTOPADHYAYA, *Tāranātha's History*, p. 156.

119 See CHIMPA and CHATTOPADHYAYA, *Tāranātha's History*, p. 175.

120 See, e.g., TSONAWA, *Indian Buddhist Pandits*, pp. 35 and 37.

121 Time did not permit me to analyze STEIN's sources.

Abhidharmasamuccayavyākhyā

The dating of the main Indian commentary on the AS, the ASBh, is aggravated by the fact that even the traditional accounts name different authors.[122] The authorship of this work is ascribed to a certain rGyal ba'i sras (*Jinaputra) in the Tibetan colophons, and to *Buddhasiṃha (覺師子), who is said to have been a disciple of Asaṅga, by the Chinese tradition.[123] Still, it was the famous Bu ston himself who ascribed the authorship of a "commentary on the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*" to Sthiramati in his "History of Buddhism".[124]

As for the ASVy, the Tibetan colophons accredit its editing to the same rGyal ba'i sras, whereas the Chinese tradition holds that it was done by Sthiramati.[125] The classical phrasing is that the ASVy, the "blended *samuccaya*" (雜集論), was "mixed" (糅) by Sthiramati.[126] What further complicates the issue is that the *Triṃśikābhāṣya* ascribed to Sthiramati contains several sentences that are literally identical to the ASBh, but as far as I see that is not a proof that both texts were written by the same author, especially as

---

[122] On the authorship, see SCHMITHAUSEN, *Nirvāṇa-Abschnitt*, p.101, note y., DE JONG "Compendium", p. 340f., TATIA, *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣyam*, p. xxiif., Nguyen, *Sthiramati's Interpretation*, pp. 39ff., TSUKAMOTO, et al., *Ronshohen*, p. 349, and DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 266, n. 14. Both PRADHAN (*Abhidharma Samuccaya*, introduction, p. 19) and FRAUWALLNER (*Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 425) claim that the ASBh was written by Sthiramati. POWERS (*Yogācāra School*, p. 51f.) ascribes the ASBh to Sthiramati, but mentions the differing traditions (*ibid.*, p. 21).

[123] See e.g. XUANZANG's travelogue (T 2087, 896c1-2): 無著弟子佛陀僧訶(唐言師子覺), where, nonetheless, the word order in the gloss (師子覺) is quite puzzling. TATIA (*Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣyam*, p. xxii) refers to a Chinese tradition according to which the ASBh was written by Sthiramati, an opinion followed by BANDURSKI ("Göttinger Sammlungen", p. 56), although there is, to my knowledge, no Chinese primary source that would make that claim. It rather seems that TATIA occasionally considered $ASVy_c$ to be a translation of the ASBh.

[124] According to Bu ston, *Chos kyi 'byung gnas*, fol. 107b6 (OBERMILLER, *History of Buddhism*, vol. 2, p. 148), Sthiramati was the author of a commentary on the AS (*chos mngon pa kun las btus kyi 'grel pa*). That opinion is followed, for example, by the 18th century scholar YONGS 'DZIN YE SHES RGYAL MTSHAN (*Lam rim bla ma brgyud pa*, p. 84f.).

[125] On the method of combining AS and ASBh into the ASVy, see my section "How are the AS and the ASBh 'Mixed' in the ASVy?", below.

[126] See, e.g., HUIZHAO (惠沼, 650-714): "雜集論(名分別名數論。亦名廣陳體義論)。此論本是無著等造。今盛行者唯覺師子釋。安惠菩薩糅。" (*Cheng weishi lun liaoyi deng*, 成唯識論了義燈, T 1832, 666b2-4, CBETA ed.). See also TAKASAKI ("Kanzōdenshō", p. 515) and the sources mentioned in the above footnote on the authorship of the ASBh. The appellation *slob dpon rgyal ba'i sras* surely points to *rgyal ba'i sras* as a personal name, still, at the risk of complicating the issue, I do want to add that *jinaputra* is a common epithet for a Bodhisattva (such as Maitreya, see SUGURO, *Shokiyuishiki*, p. 8). JI refers to the "the Bodhisattva Sthiramati" in the above mentioned passage (今盛行者唯覺師子釋。安惠菩薩糅。), but a source that would refer to Sthiramati simply as "the *jinaputra*" is not known to me.

the parallel phrases often consist of standard definitions of certain mental factors.[127]

	Tibetan colophons	Chinese tradition
AS	Asaṅga (Thogs med)	Asaṅga (無著) (HUIZHAO: "and others", 等)
ASBh	*Jinaputra (rGyal ba'i sras)	*Buddhasiṃha (覺師子, 師子覺, 佛陀僧訶)
ASVy	*Jinaputra (rGyal ba'i sras)	Sthiramati (安慧)

Table: Authors of AS, ASBh, and ASVy according to the Tibetan and Chinese traditions

As for Jinaputra, this is quite surely the commentator on the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, whom TATZ (*Chapter on Ethics*, p. 29) dates to the seventh or eighth century, because the said commentary was probably composed between that of Guṇaprabha (seventh century) and that of *Samudramegha (late eighth century).[128] JI (632-682), on the other hand claims that Jinaputra[129] was a disciple of Dharmapāla (530-561), which would mean that he probably lived in the sixth century.[130] As JI's teacher XUANZANG had travelled to India between 629 and 645, the latter dating is probably more accurate. In the context of Jinaputra's commentaries on the YBh, DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 250) mentions another important fact, namely that his **Yogācārabhūmivyākhyā* was actually considered a multiple-author composition. The header to XUANZANG's translation states that it was composed "by Jinaputra and (various, 諸?) other Bodhisattvas" (最勝子等諸菩薩造). DELEANU (*ibid.*) proposes that Jinaputra may have been the "main compiler" of the **Yogācārabhūmivyākhyā*, which was probably a "collective work (or exegetical collection?)".[131] Due to the diverse ascriptions of the ASBh and ASVy seen above, it is certainly possible that Jinaputra equally edited and unified several transmitted

---

[127] According to BUESCHER (*Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya*, p. viii, n. 2), Sthiramati had the habit of "reusing phrases, once formulated on certain topics, when arriving at the corresponding contexts in the different commentaries." Still, BUESCHER (*op.cit.*, p. 3) makes no statement as to the authorship of the ASBh and the ASVy, though stressing the importance of the ASBh for the study of Sthiramati's TrBh.

[128] The name is this scholar, rGya mtsho sprin in Tibetan, is normally rendered as Sāgaramegha.

[129] T 1830, 232a4f.: 梵云辰那弗多羅。唐言勝子.

[130] See DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 250.

[131] DELEANU (*op.cit.*, p. 230, n. 187) dates the **Yogācārabhūmivyākhyā* to the middle or the second half of the 6th century. In his travelogue, XUANZANG (T 2087, 937c10-11) mentions only Jinaputra (慎那弗呾羅。唐言最勝子) as the author of the **Yogācārabhūmivyākhyā* (瑜伽師地論釋, T 1580). For more details on the prolific author JINAPUTRA, see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, pp. 248-251.

commentaries.[132] He may have had lecture notes by Buddhasiṃha at hand, either separate from an AS MS he may have possessed, or written on his AS MS. In search for a hypothesis that would explain the differing ascriptions of the ASBh, I here cannot present more than unfounded speculations, the easiest being, of course, that *both* Buddhasiṃha and Jinaputra played a role in it. A similar hypothesis is possible in the case of the ASVy, i.e. that both Jinaputra and Sthiramati contributed to its composition. But the ascription to Sthiramati may have also been made merely on the basis of the many parallels between the TrBh and the ASBh (=ASVy in this respect).[133]

I make the above proposition, i.e. that the ASBh is the combination of several commentaries, on the base of historical sources such as colophons and chronicles while, on the other hand, I see no text-internal evidence for it, in neither doctrine nor language. Now, one may think that the combination theory may be the explanation for another puzzling phenomenon, viz. that there are only few commentaries on the AS, i.e. the ASBh (and ASVy) and possibly the commentary by Jñānamitra. Still, I think there are other explanations for that phenomenon, firstly that the ASBh is really solid and exhaustive, and secondly that the AS was mostly studied as an introduction to Yogācāra thought, so that the students who wished to go into further detail turned to the works like the YBh or the *Madhyāntavibhāga* and their commentaries. The situation, I think, changed for example in Tibet when interest in Yogācāra diminished in favour of the works of Candrakīrti and Dharmakīrti: the study of the YBh was neglected and the AS became the main source for Yogācāra Abhidharma. At any rate, although I sometimes doubt that the explanations of the ASBh match the intention of the original author, I see no reason to doubt that the ASBh author stood in a lineage of oral transmission going back to the AS.

Key Issues in the AS Exposition of *Karman*

The *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, being truly a compendium (*samuccaya*), contains little original thought, but rather offers explanations that can mostly be traced back to older sources. Not only that, but the various explanations often appear to be simply

---

[132] I completely agree with DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 152f.) in that some amount of oral transmission has to be taken into consideration, even though written textual evidence must be the cornerstone of any solid history of ideas in Sanskrit Abhidharma. In the field of Tibetology, it is well known that some works ascribed to great masters are actually *zin-bris* commentaries, lecture notes edited by a disciple. For a rather recent example where a disciple acted as scribe, see JACKSON, *Saint in Seattle*, p. 54.

[133] Although the variety of possible scenarios is not unlimited, it is nonetheless vast. Sthiramati may, for example, have used his TrBh when writing his notes on the AS, or vice versa, adopting the definitions from Buddhasiṃha's AS commentary for the TrBh. I assume Sthiramati was already a well-versed scholar when he wrote the TrBh, wherefore I find more probable than not that he had studied the AS before. Traditional Tibetan lineage records claim that Vasubandhu, the author of the *Triṃśikā*, was his predecessor in the AS lineage, which is in fact historically improbable. Nonetheless, even if Vasubandhu was not his teacher for the AS, the young Sthiramati *may* have first learned the standard definitions in an AS class (possibly even before studying the AKBh) and used those definitions later when he wrote his TrBh.

concatenated, lacking an elaborate superstructure or a systematic harmonization. It can be expected that monks of that period knew the more important canonical sūtras. They thus had a framework in which to incorporate the information from the AS, quite different from that which the contemporary reader can be expected to have. To provide a sort of red thread for reading through the text, the examples below introduce some of the main questions that arose in the Indian Buddhist exposition of *karman*.[134]

***Karman*: Mental or Material?**

While the Theravāda tradition, for example, generally explains *karman* as an essentially mental phenomenon, varying degrees of materiality have been postulated and denied in the history of Indian Buddhist thought.[135] Nowhere in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and its Indian commentaries can I find this issue identified and explained as such, but as far as I see, the AS proceeds on the basis of the common Buddhist doctrine that *karman* in its causal aspect is intention (*cetanā*), and therefore immaterial. In its resultant aspect, *karman* is feeling (*vedanā*),[136] and thus equally mental. Still, the AS also contains sections in which it is stated that, for example, certain external objects are the "sovereign fruit" (*adhipatiphala*, AS 54,9-10) of *karman*, or that *karman* "entails" (*ā-/kṣip*) the bodies of sentient beings.[137] Such inconsistencies are not rare in Abhidharma literature, and especially the AS frequently contains contradictory doctrines side-by-side, without any serious attempt at harmonization.

The AS addresses neither the question of the materiality of *karman* explicitly, nor the question how *karman* is to be understood in the context of the idealistic *cittamātra* doctrine. That, again, is an indication that idealist thought plays a much lesser role in the AS, than, for example, in the MSg.[138]

The Identity of Agent and Recipient and the Appropriation of *Karman*.

The doctrine that the agent of *karman* will reap its result[139] certainly does imply

---

[134] For an outline of central issues of Buddhist *karman* doctrine, see also LAMOTTE, "Traité de l'acte", p. 153f. On pre-Buddhist and non-Buddhist developments, see, e.g., HALBFASS, *Karma und Wiedergeburt*, KRAGH, *Action and Result*, pp. 11-14, or SCHMITHAUSEN, *Sentience of Plants*, pp. 97-99.

[135] The Theravāda position that karmically relevant action is purely mental is defended against other views at *Kathāvatthu* 380-394, and that its result is purely mental at *Kathāvatthu* 349-355 (see MCDERMOTT, *Early Buddhist Concept of Kamma*, pp. 87f., 93). Similar doctrines are mentioned in the **Tattvasiddhi* and the AKBh. They are ascribed to the Dārṣṭāntikas in the **Mahāvibhāṣā* (see KHANG DKAR, *Deb ther gser po*, p. 168f.). On the materiality of karmic results, see also SCHMITHAUSEN, *External World*, p. 50f.

[136] See the definition of *vedanā* at AS 2,14f: *Vedanā* is that mental factor which experiences the ripening of *karman*.

[137] See also my discussion of *ākṣepaka* in the notes ad AS 54,11-12.

[138] See MSg II.10 and FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 328f.

[139] The well-known statement that "all beings are ... heirs of [their] actions" (*sabbe sattā ... kammadāyādā*) is found at AN III, p.74. See also AS 60,23-61,1.

that there is some kind of continuity linking the agent and the recipient. There must further be a principle that links *karman* (as a potentiality) to that continuity.[140] Those postulates seem to contradict the Buddhist denial of a personal substratum, an objection that is raised at *Milindapañha* II.1.[141] The Ābhidharmikas struggled hard to find convincing answers, especially as their position invites criticism from both the Brahmanical schools (who upheld the unchanging Self) and the materialists.[142] Answers were found, but their variety has also led to internal dispute.[143]

Sarvāstivāda: Actions Exist in the Past

The peculiar solution of the Sarvāstivāda school was that the original action continues to exist, like all past phenomena. It could thus affect the mental continuum at the moment the fruit arises.[144] To the Sarvāstivāda claim that past and future phenomena exist in the present, Vasubandhu rightly objects in his *Karmasiddhi*, that, if the past and the future exist in the present, then future phenomena could equally be the cause of present karmic fruition.[145] Indeed, just by means of common sense, it is difficult to see why the *existence* of a past phenomenon should necessarily be the cause for the existence of a certain present phenomenon, such as a sensation in a mental continuum, because by that rationale, *any* present phenomenon could be caused by any past, present, or even future phenomenon.[146] There must be something like a wormhole in the time-space

---

[140] The same issue has also been discussed in Indian non-Buddhist traditions. See SCHMITHAUSEN, "Critical Response", p. 217.

[141] See Wilhelm HALBFASS, *Karma und Wiedergeburt*, p. 189 and FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, pp. 67f., 72-74. According the FRAUWALLNER (*op.cit.*, p. 65), the *Milindapañha* is the first Buddhist text that provides a clear and complete refutation of the *ātman*. It is thus no surprise to find the objection about *karman* discussed there, too. See also SCHMITHAUSEN, "Critical Response", p. 216f. MN III, p. 19 states that "formations" (*saṅkhārā*, just like the other four groups) are not the self (*anattā*), and "what self do the actions done by what is not the self affect?" (*anattakatāni kammāni kam attānaṃ phusissanti*). See GLASS, "Karma and Yogācāra", p. 3.

[142] The trilateral dispute is outlined in HALBFASS, *Karma und Wiedergeburt*, p. 184f.

[143] The Buddhist doctrine of a *pudgala* (person) that is both agent and recipient of *karman* (*pudgalavāda*) appears as a strong and active strand of Indian Buddhism from the *Kathāvatthu*, through the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* to the travelogue of XUANZANG.

[144] See WILLEMEN, DESSEIN and COX, *Sarvāstivāda*, p. 21, and SCHMITHAUSEN, "Critical Response", p. 219.

[145] *Karmadsiddhi*$_{t,P}$ 160b8-161a1: *gang gi ltar na 'das pa yod pa de'i ltar na ma 'ongs pa yang rdzas su yod pa yin na ci'i phyir 'bras bu mi 'phen /.* An earlier Sarvāstivāda attempt to establish the temporal order of causation can be seen in RYŌSE, *Abhidharmahṛdaya*, pp. 326-328 (=T 1552, 897c20-27). On the contested Sarvāstivāda theory that a present cause establishes a connection to its future effect by "grasping" it, see FRAUWALLNER, *Studies in Abhidharma*, p. 195.

[146] See *Karmadsiddhi*$_{t,P}$ 161a1f. (ed. MUROJI): *'dir gang las de'i 'bras bu 'di yin no zhes rnam par gzhag* (DC *gzhag*; PN *bzhag*) *pa 'grub par 'gyur ba 'di la gang zhig ni nus pa yang ci zhig yin /.*

continuum that links the cause to the time and place of the result.[147] In his critique of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (AKBh), the Sarvāstivādin Saṅghabhadra states that the allotment of karmic reward is made possible though an entity called "obtainment" (*prāpti*),[148] a concept which is in earlier Sarvāstivāda sources used to explain the possession of vows, spiritual achievements, or defilements.[149]

I will discuss some more specific historical aspects of this issue in the remainder of this section. If, as the available texts suggest, *prāpti* was not explicitly used to explain karmic retribution in the **Mahāvibhāṣa* and earlier, it can at least be seen why that concept came in handy for that purpose: the "obtainment" of present and past *dharmas*, for example wholesome acts (of the *vijñapti* and *avijñapti* type in the *kāmadhātu*), is well attested at AKBh 64,13. A morally insignificant *dharma* (i.e. *anivṛta-avyākṛta*) can only be possessed in the present because it is of feeble power (*durbalatvāt*, AKBh 65,11), which means, according to the commentary, "because it is without an impulse/concentrated effort" (*anabhisaṃskāravattvād*, AKVy 152,8), and I think this should be seen in the light of the definition of *karman* = *cetanā* = *abhisaṃskāra*, which I discuss in my notes ad AS 53,6.[150]

Another question is whether the concept of *prāpti* was actually fit to explain the relation between a karmic cause and its result. KRAGH (*Action and Result*, p. 259, n. 420) states that "the relationships between action [...] and doer [...] and again between result [...] and consumer [...] do not constitute causal relationships but relationships of possession." Logically, KRAGH presupposes that "causal" and "possession" are mutually exclusive: whatever is a possession cannot be causal, and vice versa. That is, nonetheless, untenable from a commonsensical point of view: possession must be a *cause* because it has any *effect*,[151] and indeed also AKBh 63,10 and 16 classifies *prāpti* as *utpattihetu* and *vyavasthāhetu*. In this special case, one may reasonably argue that the doer is a *cause* of the action–and thus the indirect *cause* of the result which in turn affects the consumer. Therefore, I rather agree with COX (*Disputed Dharmas*, p. 96), who states that "the

---

[147] By "time and place" I mean the moment (*kṣaṇa*) in the mental continuum at which the karmic result occurs, most classically a pleasant or unpleasant sensation (*vedanā*).

[148] T 1562, 535a26-28: 說異熟因相續無斷。得體實有。先已成立。即說此得。爲相續體. See SCHMITHAUSEN, "Critical Response", p. 229, n. 136. According to RUEGG (*Two Prolegomena*, p. 161, n. 11), the Tibetan doxographer Go rams pa curiously ascribes this view to the Sautrāntikas.

[149] See, for example the * *Mahāvibhāṣā* (有作是說。別解脫律儀。從初表業發得已後。於一切時現在成就, 643c18), RYŌSE, *Abhidharmahṛdaya*, p. 157, WILLEMEN, DESSEIN and COX, *Sarvāstivāda*, p. 204. Also Tsong kha pa was aware of discrepancies among the Vaibhāṣika interpretations of *prāpti*. See SCHMITHAUSEN, "Critical Response", p. 219.

[150] For a discussion of *prāpti* in the *Viniścayasaṃgrahaṇī*, see KRITZER, *Rebirth and Causation*, pp. 239-245. About the concept of *prāpti* in the AS, I can, for reasons of time, note nothing more than that karman is not mentioned in the whole Prāptiviniścaya section. According to SCHMITHAUSEN ("Walpola Rahulas Übersetzung", p. 114) the author of the Prāptiviniścaya knew the *prāpti* theory of the Sarvāstivādins, and partly reinterpreted it at AS 76,19-21.

[151] See also STCHERBATSKY, *Madhyānta-vibhanga*, p. 033, n. 76.

theories of possession and seeds represent only two of many models used by various Buddhists to account for direct and indirect causal efficacy in the face of momentariness and the absence of a unifying substratum." It seems that also Candrakīrti was aware of Saṅghabhadra's argument, or some version of it, as he lists *prāpti* among the ways various Buddhist schools of thought account for *karmaphalasaṃbandha*.[152] Tsong kha pa, in his commentary on the respective passage, does not object to Candrakīrti's classification.[153]

To put it in more general terms: I am not sure whether the Sarvāstivādin's **traikalyavāda* coherently corresponds to a four-dimensional time-space continuum, in which time is, just as space, one of the modes in which information is stored, to put it in modern terms.[154] In such a model, the past exists in its own mode, just like the present and the future. Hypothetically assuming such a model, a spatial connection would be just as "causal" as a temporal one.[155] Looking at the issue of *prāpti*, both a temporal relation (cause and effect, doer and consumer), as well as a spatial relation (cause and doer, effect and consumer) are at stake.[156] Thus, as far as I see, four factors that stand in a certain relation here:

1.) a person doing the action, or, in more Abhidharmic terms a moment in a *cittasaṃtāna* at that very point in time when the karmic act is done (x_1),

2.) a karmic cause at that same point in time, i.e. the morally distinct *cetanā* belonging to that very *cittasaṃtāna* at that moment (n_1),

3.) a person experiencing the karmic result of that act at a second point in time (which may well be millions of years later), i.e. a *cittasaṃtāna* (x_2) endowed with a pleasant or unpleasant *vedanā*, and

4.) the karmic result, the *vedanā* (n_2) belonging to that *cittasaṃtāna* at that second point in time.

In his "Critical Response" (p. 219), SCHMITHAUSEN suggests that *prāpti* is not the entity which "guarantees [the past act's] capacity to fructify at a much later time". It "is responsible rather for the fact that a certain karma belongs to, and consequently fructifies

---

152 This is documented in KRAGH, *Action and Result*, p. 259, n. 420, but cf. *ibid*, p. 267.

153 See ACIP S5408, fol. 126ab, and SCHMITHAUSEN, "Critical Response", p. 219.

154 The model of the Sarvāstivādins, in which past and future events exist just like present ones, is very similar to the approach of modern physics where time is treated as the fourth dimension. They were clearly ahead of their time and its is a pity that their model did not receive the recognition it deserves. At times, so it appears, they themselves were not bold enough when faced with critique and watered down their model.

155 See also BUESCHER's very reasonable remarks (*Vijñānavāda*, p. 46, n. 1) on the distinction between synchronic and diachronic Abhidharma analysis.

156 The relation between a moment of pure consciousness (*citta*) and its accompanying *caitasikadharma*s such as (*vedanā* or *cetanā*) is not strictly speaking spatial, but at least in the case of humans, a mental continuum has appropriated a certain body*yus, rūpa, kāyendriya*. Mental events (perceiving, feeling, intending, ...) happen related to that one body, and not another.

in, one 'stream of personality' (*saṃtāna*) and not another". In the fourfold model I propose above, that would mean that *prāpti* forms a link between x_1 and n_1 as well as x_2 and n_2, *but not* between x_1 and x_2, wherefore it is not *karmaphalasambhandha*. I can agree with this only in so far as *prāpti* certainly does not deal with the relation x_1 and x_2 directly and exclusively. Nonetheless, I cannot agree with the proposition that *prāpti* does not deal with the relation x_1 to x_2 at all. *Prāpti*, in *karman* theory, seems to signify firstly the connection between x_1 and n_1, then the connection between n_1 (existing in the past) and every following moment in the *cittasaṃtāna* up to x_2, and lastly the connection between n_1 and x_2. Only the connection between n_1 and x_2 makes n_2 possible. In so far, *prāpti* deals with the connection between n_1 and n_2 *via* x_2. This detour is still acceptable for explaining the connection between a karmic cause and its result. Candrakīrti was probably right in counting *prāpti* among the ways of explaining the connection between n_1 and n_2 (*karmaphalasambhandha*), even though that explanation takes x_1 and x_2 into account. All Buddhist schools were faced with the dilemma of karmic retribution in the absence of an *ātman*, or, to put it in terms of the above analysis, proving the thesis that: For a wholesome action (n_1), you (x_1 and x_2) will experience pleasure (n_2), even though there is no *ātman* ($x_1 \neq x_2$). If the resultant theory is meant as a defense against both materialists and personalists, will ideally cover karmic fruition as well as personal continuity.[157] The exact role *prāpti* played in Sarvāstivāda *karman* theory has yet to be ascertained. Any substantial investigation would of course have to include a close scrutiny of primary sources--which is unfortunately beyond the scope of this study.

"Sautrāntika": A Particular Transformation of Mind and the Storehouse Consciousness

Vasubandhu had in his AKBh advocated a "Sautrāntika" position, holding that a karmic result is "a special [culmination of] the transformation of mind", which means the final moment of period of latency during which the mental continuum undergoes subtle changes due to the initial act, or, after a seed (*bīja*) is planted in the mind, more or less metaphorically speaking. In his *Karmasiddhi*, he openly propagates the *ālayavijñāna*, a basic layer of consciousness which comprises the seeds planted by past actions, a classical Yogācāra doctrine.[158]

The AS Position

As stated above, the term *ālayavijñāna* does not appear in the AS section on *karman*, and neither does *prāpti* in Saṅghabhadra's sense of a condition for karmic

---

[157] On *prāpti*, see also WALDRON, *The Buddhist Unconscious*, p. 72f.

[158] The *ālayavijñāna* was most probably not initially invented to account for the retribution of *karman*, but for the re-emergence of consciousness after the "attainment of cessation" (*nirodhasamāpatti*). See SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, pp. 1-6. Those two issues were sometimes considered to be closely related: Saṅghabhadra actually argues against the AKBh model of karmic retribution through a subtle transformation of the mental continuum on the grounds that the continuum was interrupted in the *nirodhasamāpatti*. See SASAKI, *Gōron*, p. 476f.

fruition.[159] The AS does not discuss the controversial issue of "the connection between *karman* and its result" (*karmaphalasaṃbandha*) at the expense of philosophical depth. When explaining the famous sūtra passage which states that beings are "heirs to their *karman*" (*karmadāyāda*), the AS rather laconically postulates the "experience of the ripening of what one has done oneself" (*svayaṃkṛtavipākapratisaṃvedanā*, AS 61,2-3).[160] On another occasion, the AS states that the "heaping up [of *karman*] is the increase of the imprints" (*upacayo vāsanāvṛddhi,* AS 53,20), without explaining what is imprinted or where the heaping up and increase take place. It is only the ASBh that refers to the *ālayavijñāna* in this context and thus takes the stance of a mainstream Yogācāra treatise.

Determinism

Buddhist scholars clearly differentiated their own doctrine from extreme determinism, as it was personified in Makkhali Gosāla, the alleged founder of the Ājīvikas.[161] But in order to avoid determinist implications, it was necessary for the Buddhists to take specific stances on several doctrinal issues, such as the distinction between karmic causes and their result, or the modalities of karmic retribution. If, for example, a morally determined act could be the result of a past act, as well as the cause of a future one, a chain reaction could ensue that would leave no space for free decisions. Most Abhidharma schools therefore defined the results of *karman* as morally indeterminate (*avyākṛta*).[162] A special case is the formation of habits, which implies that one action can cause another. Although that was to some extent accepted, Buddhist scholars emphasized the precepts (*śīla*)[163] which can counteract bad habits[164] if observed with the necessary effort.[165] Buddhism generally denied that all fortune and misfortune

---

[159] The AS explanation of "the action of obtainment" (*prāptikarman*) in the sense of the obtainment of nirvana rather resembles what COX (*Disputed Dharmas*, p. 76, n. 20) describes as "the primary use in early Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma texts of *prāpti* in relation to praxis and the abandonment of defilements", as described above.

[160] As far as I see, the Sarvāstivāda treatise *Abhidharmahṛdaya* (ca. 3rd century CE) also does not contain a serious attempt to prove karmic causation. The causal relations between actions and their results are simply postulated (see RYŌSE, *Abhidharmahṛdaya*, p. 320f., T 1550, p. 815A3-12) but, at least in the *karman* section, neither the existence of the past, nor "obtainment", "grasping" or any other concept is invoked to prove *karman* systematically.

[161] Makkhali Gosāla's views are described in DN I, pp. 53-55. See HALBFASS, *Karma und Wiedergeburt*, p. 178f. On determinism, see also LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Morale*, p. 203.

[162] *Kathāvatthu* 357-359. See MCDERMOTT, *Early Buddhist Concept of Kamma*, pp. 80, 91f. See also TAKASAKI, *Introduction to Buddhism*, pp. 123, 140, and BUESCHER, *Vijñānavāda*, p. 112.

[163] One of the meanings of *śīla*, if not used as a Buddhist technical term, is simply "habit".

[164] Bad habits, i.e. unwholesome patterns of behaviour, are exemplified by "bad discipline" (*dauḥśīlya*) at ASBh 68,4.

[165] ASBh 68,1-4 mentions the purpose and the difficulty of observing the precepts.

derive from karmic retribution,[166] and only certain modalities of the retribution were considered to be determined (*niyata*). The extent of that determination was nonetheless contested.[167]

Sure enough, also the AS proceeds on the basis of non-determinism, but still postulates a strange concept of "certainty of doing the action" (*karmakriyāniyama*, AS 54,1-2), which ASBh 64,23-26 explains as the absolute necessity to do a certain action at a certain time. That necessity, the ASBh states, is brought about by previous *karman*. Another doctrine that seems inconsistent with strict non-determinism appears in the ASVy, in the explanation of the concordant fruit (*niṣyandaphala*) of the three unwholesome mental actions: covetousness has violent desire as its concordant fruit, harmful intent has violent hatred, and wrong view has violent delusion.[168] If one takes into account that those very three, desire, hatred and delusion are known as the "roots of the unwholesome [actions]" (*akuśalamūlāni*), one could easily object that this doctrine has the unwanted implication of a self-propelling karmic result. Those two above-mentioned doctrines are clearly do not go along well with the rule that the result of *karman* is morally indeterminate, and a serious attempt to make those ideas compatible is not visible in the AS.

For the sake of completeness it has to be said that the doctrine of the character being influenced by karmic residues, as held by Buddhist scholasticism, does not necessarily imply an ideology of determinism. On the other hand it is equally true that the doctrine of determinism, as allegedly held by the Ajīvikas, does not necessarily lead to fatalism in the sense of defeatism. The latter aspect is of great interest for the understanding of Buddhist *karman* doctrine, too, and I have to apologize that I cannot deal with it appropriately in the scope of this thesis.

---

166 See, e.g., HALBFASS, *Karma und Wiedergeburt*, p. 116-118, MCDERMOTT, *Early Buddhist Concept of Kamma*, p. 16f., and the *Moliyasīvakasutta*, SN IV, p. 230f. ("There are cases where some feelings arise based on bile [...], phlegm [...], the change of seasons [...], the result of kamma." THANISSARO BHIKKHU, Wings to Awakening, p. 54).

167 See MCDERMOTT, *Early Buddhist Concept of Kamma*, p. 16f., and his "*Kathāvatthu* Kamma Debates", p. 611f.

168 See also my notes ad ASBh 65,14.

Previous Research on the AS and Its Commentaries

What follows is an annotated bibliographical list of the studies that proved most important for my research. I will dwell on evaluations of PRADHAN's edition and RAHULA's translation a bit more extensively as a new edition and translation such as mine indeed needs justification. For reasons of time, I could not address the studies by BUESCHER, DELEANU, DELHEY and WALDRON. A separate listing of editions and translations of the AS, ASBh and ASVy can be found in my section on the textual witnesses, below.

1935. Daijō TOKIWA and Yūki REIMON. *Daijō abidatsumazōshūron* (大乘阿毘達磨雑集論). Kokuyaku Issaikyō, Yugabu, vol. 10. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha.

This translation of the $ASVy_c$ into Japanese prose consists of the Chinese text arranged Japanese word order, with particles and inflection markers inserted (書き下し文), while preserving XUANZANG's vocabulary. The translation is a very helpful aid for analyzing the Chinese syntax, and the translators have occasionally treated as compounds those phrases they could not dissolve. Annotation is sparse: the only footnote for the *karman* section, for example, refers the scroll numbers of the respective explanations on *karman* in the *Yogācārabhūmi*$_c$.

1947. V.V. GOKHALE. "Fragments from the Abhidharmasamuccaya of Asaṅga", Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society 23, pp. 13-38.

The AS Sanskrit fragments photographed in Zhwa-lu monastery in 1934 cover approximately forty percent of the whole text.[169] GOKHALE here presents a reliable edition of the preserved Sanskrit text. It was prepared by taking the Tibetan and Chinese versions of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and the *Abhidharmasamuccayavyākhyā*, as well as the Sanskrit MS and the Tibetan version of the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* into account, but a critical apparatus is regrettably lacking. For the Tibetan versions, only the sNar-thang edition in the possession of the Adyar Library was used. Changes in the Sanskrit punctuation partially follow the Chinese version (Taishō edition). For assistance with the Chinese texts GOKHALE turned to a Professor KIN KEMO, who is otherwise, regrettably, completely unknown to me.

1950. Pralhad PRADHAN. *Abhidharma Samuccaya of Asaṅga*. Santiketan: Visva-Bharati.

This second publication of the Sanskrit AS text contains not only the sections preserved in the MS, but also Sanskrit retranslations of the other sections.[170] Those are based on the Chinese version of the AS (AS_c), with consultation of the ASBh MS, and the

---

[169] See also GOKHALE ("Rare Manuscript", p. 210) to the same effect. Those photos were taken by Rahula Sāṅkṛtyāyana on his second expedition to Tibet and their negatives are preserved at the Bihar Research Society. See PRADHAN, *Abhidharma Samuccaya*, p. 5f.

[170] Cf. TOLA and DRAGONETTI (*Being As Consciousness*, p. xix) who wrongly claim that the AS is preserved in Sanskrit.

Tibetan sNar-thang edition ($AS_{t,N}$).[171] The aim of PRADHAN's retranslation is to make the contents of the AS available in Sanskrit. He explicitly disclaims any attempt to reconstruct the original Sanskrit text–an important factor if his efforts are to be evaluated.[172] Even within that framework, the retranslation is at times unsatisfactory, up to the point of Sanskrit grammar. PRADHAN normally renders the explicative elements added by XUANZANG. He marks those elements—although not with reliable consistency—as "Does not exist in the Tibetan version" ("*bho. nāsti*"), wrongly assuming that those elements originate from XUANZANG's Sanskrit MS,[173] which is often surely not the case. Even if those elements belonged to another MS tradition, their inclusion would not be justified for an accurate retranslation, as PRADHAN renders the passages preserved in Sanskrit following the Zhwa-lu MS, which mostly agrees with the Tibetan version. The introduction contains a list of passages where AS_t and AS_c are in agreement but deviate from the MS. In at least one instance, PRADHAN has incorporated a misspelling of the ASBh MS into his retranslation (*atanutāpya*, AS 60,20).

PRADHAN has also located parallels and quotations in the *Triṃśikābhāṣya*, the *Cheng weishi lun* (成唯識論), and the *Abhisamayālaṃkārālokā*. He considers the parallels in the *Triṃśikābhāṣya* an indication that the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* was written by the same author, Sthiramati (introduction, p. 19). It seems that PRADHAN assumed the Chinese tradition to ascribe the ASBh to Sthiramati (and not to Buddhasiṃha). That is, he most likely took the $ASVy_c$ to be the Chinese translation of the ASBh.[174] PRADHAN provides a summary of the whole AS (introduction, pp. 23-31).

1956. Masayoshi TAKASAKI. "Daijō abidatsuma zōshūron oyobi zōshūron to sanjūju anne shaku to no kanren ni tsuite" (大乘阿毘達磨集論及び雑集論と三十頌安慧釈との関連について, A Comparative Study of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and

---

[171] Also BHATTACARYA (*Yogācārabhūmi*, p. iii) used a sNar-thang xylograph (belonging to Visvabharati University, Calcutta) for his edition of the YBh that was published seven years later (1957). PRADHAN did not state clearly that the edition he used was from sNar thang (see his introduction, p. 9), but this was pointed out by DE JONG ("Compendium", p. 340) later.

[172] "I have used the word 'restoration' because it is a popular term. Personally I prefer the word 'translation' or 'retranslation'. I do not believe that a lost book or portion may be restored even from the Tibetan in the proper sense of the term. In my opinion, it is very difficult, rather impossible. Therefore I call it to be translation, because it is put into or translated into Sanskrit from the Chinese and the Tibetan. It will still be better to call it 'retranslation', because first it was translated into the Chinese and Tibetan and now it is translated again from them into Sanskrit. [sic]" (introduction, p. 21f.). Cf. NAKAMURA, *Indian Buddhism*, p. 303, n. 14: "restorational sanskrit"; DE JONG, "Compendium", p. 340: "une restitution sanskrite"; FUNAHASHI, "Sengo", p. 15: "restored Sanskrit (還元梵語)".

[173] See PRADHAN's introduction, p. 14: "These differences also suggest [...] that there were different recensions of the Abhidharmasamuccaya".

[174] That $ASVy_c$ is the Chinese equivalent to $ASVy_t$ and not to $ASBh_t$ is already made clear in the Tōhoku catalogue of 1934. See UI, et al., eds, *Bkaḥ-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur*, entries 4053 and 4054. In 1947, GOKHALE ("Fragments", p. 13) seems to have confused the ASBh with the ASVy for he claims that the ASBh was allegedly translated into Tibetan by Jinamitra and Śīlendrabodhi.

***Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* in Relation to *Triṃśikābhāṣya*). *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 7, pp. (116)-(117).**

TAKASAKI evaluates some of the parallels (presented by PRADHAN) between the AS (PRADHAN's edition) and Sthiramati's *Triṃśikābhāṣya*. To that, TAKASAKI adds parallels to the *Triṃśikābhāṣya* in the ASBh (Tibetan, Peking edition, with reference to ASVy$_c$). These parallels are clearly dependent and TAKASAKI claims that the *Triṃśikābhāṣya* quotes from the ASBh, but in the frame of this two-page article he does not provide any compelling evidence that the ASBh was composed before the TrBh. I assume that TAKASAKI presupposes the seniority of the ASBh for other reasons. In my own opinion, the TrBh appears as a much more balanced, orderly exposition than the ASBh, but that alone does not prove the seniority of the ASBh.

1963. Erich FRAUWALLNER. "Abhidharma-Studien: I. Pañcaskandhakam und Pañcavastukam", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 7, pp. 20- 36.

FRAUWALLNER presents a short outline of AS 1,7-31,5, dealing with *skandhāḥ*, *dhātavaḥ*, and *āyatanāni*. This basic structure indicates a work of the *pañcaskandhaka* genre; Asaṅga being the author, FRAUWALLNER claims, it must belong to the Mahīśāsaka tradition (p. 32). The various *skandha*s and so on are analyzed according to ten aspects (material, immaterial, etc.) that match a list of ten aspects in the *Jñānaprasthāna*. For FRAUWALLNER, this suggests that the Mahīśāsaka transmitted the *Jñānaprasthāna* doctrines separately from the Sarvāstivāda at quite an early date since Asaṅga neglects later reinterpretations of the ten aspects in the Sarvāstivāda tradition (p. 33). The *pañcaskandhaka* section of the AS was the model for Vasubandhu's *Pañcaskandhaka* (p. 32).

FRAUWALLNER's argument implies that parts of the AS stem from a pre-*Saṃdhinirmocana* epoch, I completely agree with him in that point. Nonetheless, FRAUWALLNER's presupposition that Asaṅga was trained in Mahīśāsaka Abhidharma has become questionable at the current state of research.[175] Furthermore, I am not convinced that the "ten aspects" must have been transmitted independently within the tradition the author of AS 1,7-31,5 stood in (be it Mahīśāsaka or another). Would it not be equally possible that he had access to the *Jñānaprasthāna* and included the "ten aspects" into his treatise directly from that source? Even though Sarvāstivāda authors later than the *Jñānaprasthāna* devised their own modified lists, I see no evidence that *Jñānaprasthāna* itself was not studied anymore in Sarvāstivāda circles or by other interested scholars by the fourth century.

1971. Walpola RAHULA. Le compendium de la super-doctrine (philosophie) (Abhidharmasamuccaya) d'Asanga. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient.

This translation is based on the Sanskrit editions by GOKHALE and PRADHAN, including PRADHAN's reconstructed passages (which RAHULA rarely questions). The footnotes often appear to be based on the ASBh (probably using the Chinese or Tibetan versions as RAHULA did not have the MS), but external references normally point to Pāli

---

175 On points 1 and 2, see KRITZER, *Rebirth and Causation*, pp. 7-13.

materials and to the AKBh. RAHULA only occasionally deviates from PRADHAN's retranslation, at times referring to the Chinese text. For more details on RAHULA's work, see my discussion of the reviews by DE JONG and SCHMITHAUSEN, below.

A translation from French into English by Sara BOIN-WEBB was published in 2001 (see ASAṄGA, *Compendium* in the Bibliography). It is mostly a faithful rendering of the French version, even though BOIN-WEBB at times sought to improve the text, for example at p. 115: "hells" (RAHULA, op. cit., p. 85, n. 7: "l'enfer"). That proceeding at times lead to improvements to the worse, such as "bad roots" (p. 114, n. 83, cf. RAHULA, op. cit., p. 84, n. 7: "racines du mal").

1972. Noriaki HAKAMAYA. "On a Paragraph in the Dharmaviniścaya Chapter of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*", *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 41, pp. 40- 51 (ltrp).

A section in the AS explaining "*vaipulya*" doctrine is here compared with its (direct or indirect) source in the *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra*, and with parallel quotations in the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* and the *Mahāyānasaṃgraha*. HAKAMAYA has identified a passage which is contained in GOKHALE's edition of the AS MS, but not in AS_t or AS_c. The whole passage (AS 85,8-10) is contained in the ASBh, the ASVy,[176] and has close parallels in the *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra* and the MSg. Based on that observation, HAKAMAYA first formulates the hypothesis that ASBh text was wrongly inserted into the AS "in a later period" (p. 44), an hypothesis which he then dismisses by showing that the respective passages at MSg V.4 completely agrees with the AS. He concludes that rather "the passage which is found only in the Sanskrit of the *AS* III was written by Asaṅga himself."

In my opinion, HAKAMAYA has here found evidence that the MS used by GOKHALE contains an addition which must have been made after the MS traditions which formed the base for AS_t and AS_c had branched off. I would like to conduct a rather far-reaching speculation on the basis of HAKAMAYA's finding: I think it is not by accident that such a passage appears in the Mahāyānist *vaipulya* section.[177] The addition of an element to that section seems to indicate that it was gradually enlarged and still in a phase of growth when that addition was made. The textual evidence we have is that of an interpolation, but it may be indicative of a gradual enlargement on a larger scale, or even of a combination of older sections (which were not enlarged) with newer sections (which were enlarged as they were the focus of interest in later times). Even though research on the relative chronology of the early Yogācāra texts must take into consideration interpolations and gradual enlargement of *all* texts concerned, HAKAMAYA's findings are highly interesting. It is quite certain that many of the definitions in the ASBh go back to oral explanations by the AS author, and even the phrasing found in the ASBh may often stem from him. If an addition to the AS is also found in the ASBh, that addition may well have been made before work on the ASBh had begun. Quite possibly, some students made lecture notes on the AS even before the final redaction of the AS was decided upon.

---

[176] HAKAMAYA (p. 44, n. 21, dto. HAKAMAYA, *Yuishikishisō*, p. 324) refers to the $ASVy_c$ as the Chinese translation of ASBh, which can be quite misleading.

[177] On the definition of *vaipulya* in the AS, see also SKILLING, *Mahāsūtras*, vol. 2, p. 39f.

Again, the fact HAKAMAYA found the parallel with both MSg and ASBh in the *vaipulya* section of the AS could be an indication, that the *vaipulya* section was added and/or revised relatively late in the composition history of the AS.

On another occasion, HAKAMAYA observes that the AS MS is silent where AS$_t$ *thams cad du* indicates the word *sarvato* in the Sanskrit original (p. 42, n. 13),[178] in accordance with a parallel in the *Mahāyānasaṃgraha* (p. 44). He inserts *sarvato* into his edition of the Sanskrit AS text (p. 42, n. 13) and unfolds his argumentation partly based on that (p. 47). Against HAKAMAYA, I cannot see that also AS$_c$ indicates *sarvato* (p. 43).[179] Although this difference between AS$_t$ and the MS *may* be due to the Sanskrit version available to the AS$_t$ translators, note that also ad ASBh 73,16, ASBh$_t$ renders the plural *sattvānāṃ* as *sems can thams cad la*, a mistranslation which is corrected in the ASVy$_t$ (*sems can rnams la*).[180]

1972. Lambert SCHMITHAUSEN. "The Definition of Pratyakṣam in the Abhidharmasamuccaya", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 16, pp. 153-164.

Dealing with direct perception (*pratyakṣa*) in the AS, SCHMITHAUSEN shows convincingly that the AS, although using some of the central terms of the classical Yogācāra school, does not presuppose its distinct idealist doctrine. A phrase that explains "the character that is the nature of factors" (*dharmatālakṣaṇa*) suggests that the Tibetan translation of the AS occasionally reads more of a Mahāyāna viewpoint into the text than the Sanskrit text actually contains: the Tibetan AS reads *bdag med pa rnam pa gnyis* (AS$_{t,P}$ 62a8-b1) where ASVy$_t$ has only *bdag med pa* (ASVy$_{t,P}$ 166a1-2), in accordance with the Chinese (無我性, AS$_c$ 666a23; ASVy$_c$ 702b06).

1973. Jan Willem DE JONG. "Walpola Rahula, *Le Compendium de la Super-Doctrine (Philosophie) (Abhidharmasamuccaya) d'Asaṅga*", review article. *T'oung Pao* 59, pp. 339-346.

As is common in the late Professor DE JONG's review articles, he summarizes the most important studies published in Japanese, in this case mostly regarding the authorship of AS and ASBh. RAHULA's translation, DE JONG remarks that the terminology employed is exemplary, although the translation, being mostly based on PRADHAN's retranslations, is unreliable (p. 341). DE JONG also identifies one occasion where PRADHAN, seeing a mistake in GOKHALE's edition, has attempted a correction, but failed. This, in turn, has been realized by RAHULA, who chose to follow GOKHALE. DE

---

[178] AS$_t$: *chos kyi snang ba rnam pa yongs su ma chad pa thams chad du tshad med pa yang dag par shes pa*; AS (ed. Gokhale): *aparicinnākārāñ cāpramāṇaṃ dharmāvabhāsaṃ saṃjānāti*; HAKAMAYA (p. 42): *aparicinnākārāñ ca sarvato 'pramāṇaṃ dharmāvabhāsaṃ saṃjānāti* (my underline). HAKAMAYA (p. 42, n. 13): "This word cannot be found in the fragment, but is supplemented according to its Tibetan and Chinese translations."

[179] AS$_c$ 688a19: 三了知無量無分別相. Note that also an equivalent for *dharmāvabhāsaṃ* is missing in AS$_c$, while it is supplied in ASVy$_c$ 752c5 (大法光明).

[180] See also my notes on ASBh 65,7-8.

JONG is able to correct those three researchers (p. 344),[181] taking the MaVyu and EDGERTON's BHSD into account. He also mentions the various parallels to AS and ASBh that have been located in the *Triṃśikābhāṣya*, *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, *Mahāyānasaṃgraha*, and *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra*, and adds passages in the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, and the *Manobhūmi* of the YBh, and a quotation from the *Udānavarga* (p. 344). He criticizes RAHULA for having applied explanations from the Pāli tradition where Mahāyāna interpretations might be more suitable (*ibid.*). In one case, RAHULA supplied a Theravāda explanation, neglecting that an explanation can be found in another passage of the AS itself. DE JONG demonstrates that another shortcoming of RAHULA's work is not having used the Tibetan version exhaustively.[182]

1976. Nathmal TATIA, ed. *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣyam*. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

Among the Abhidharma works edited and published in India, TATIA's edition of the ASBh shows a high degree of reliability. Nonetheless, TATIA's understanding of the Chinese and Tibetan versions is at times blurred, while on other occasions references to those versions are missing. The identification of AS text (*pratīka*) in the ASBh (by means of bold type) is often inaccurate. TATIA normally (but not always) indicates his deviations from the MS. In preparing the edition, TATIA received assistance from Masashige SHINODA for his references to the Tibetan and Chinese versions.[183] SHINODA also went to the Bihar Research Society in Patna in order to consult the photographs preserved there, as those were slightly superior to the copies TATIA used in Nālandā.[184]

---

181 GOKHALE's edition of the AS: *bodhisattvanyāsāvakrāntaḥ* (=RAHULA, *Compendium*, p. 174, n. 1); PRADHAN's edition: *bodhim anavadyām avakrāntaḥ*; AS_c 692c1: 入菩薩超昇離生位; $AS_{t.P}$ 137a6: *byang chub sems dpa'i skyon med pa la zhugs*; de Jong: *bodhisattvanyāmāvakrāntaḥ*. According to BHSD, *nyāma* (s.v.) is equivalent to *niyāma* ("determined" or "certain" [to follow the path of the Bodhisattva]). The Tibetan *skyon med pa* ("faultless)" is attested by MaVyu 6502 (BHSD, *ibid.*: "As if ni plus āma"). Unfortunately, the term is not explained in the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* (ed. ISHIKAWA), but the Tibetan equivalent *skyon med pa* means that state where faults do not arise, obviously based on the associative etymology *ni-āma*, even though it is equally true that the Bodhisattva at that state certainly (cf. MaVyu 6501, *nges par 'gyur ba*) enters into liberation. The Chinese equivalent 離生 is quite tricky, appearing at first sight as "seperation (=freedom) from (re-)birth", or "freedom from the arising [of *kleśa*s]", but it rather seems to mean "freedom from what is raw (i.e. the *kleśa*s)", according to NAKAMURA, *Bukkyōgo daijiten*, s.v. 正性 (生はなま...). For a discussion of *nyāma*, see LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Abhidharmakośa*, vol. 4, pp. 180-182, n. 6.

182 DE JONG, "*Compendium*", p. 344: "En traduisant un texte comme l'Abhidharmasamuccaya il faut absolument avoir recours à la traduction tibétaine en premier lieu."

183 "The text has been critically edited with the help of Mr. Masashige SHINODA [...]. But for the ungrudging help of Mr. SHINODA, it would have never been possible for me to compare the text with its Tibetan and Chinese versions. He also helped me in understanding the text in many a place, and thus enabled me to arrange it in suitable sections and subsections. [...] Whatever success I have been able to achieve in editing the text is due to Mr. SHINODA [...]." (p. xxix).

184 SHINODA relates this in his foreword to SAKUMA, *Index*.

TATIA and SHINODA have worked out an outline of the whole text into paragraphs, which also includes AS paragraphs that have not been commented upon in the ASBh. Given that the inner structure of the AS is often difficult to follow, the outline is of unquestionable value, even though, as SAKUMA rightly noted, it could be improved upon in some cases.[185] TATIA's edition was reviewed by HAKAMAYA ("*Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣyam*") in 1977. SAKUMA (*Index*, pp. 5-46) provides a list of corrigenda.

1976. Lambert SCHMITHAUSEN. "Zu Walpola Rahula's Übersetzung von Asaṅga's *Abhidharmasamuccaya*", review article. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 20, pp. 111-122.

To evaluate RAHULA's translation, SCHMITHAUSEN presents his own Sanskrit reconstruction and translation of AS 76,9-77,8, dealing with the Path of Completion (*niṣṭhāmārga*), the last phase of the Path of Cultivation (*bhāvanāmārga*). RAHULA was to some extent aware of the fact that PRADHAN's edition does not comply to philological standards, but still his references to the AS_t are rare. Not having had access to the ASBh MS, he at one point tries to correct PRADHAN, changing the AS text although it is preserved in an ASBh *pratīka*.[186] SCHMITHAUSEN's thorough analysis also shows that DE JONG's praise of PRADHAN's terminology is not in every case warranted, as with "le fonctionnement de la révolution basique constante" for *nirantarāśrayapravṛttiḥ* [sic] at AS 76,11. Methodologically, a comparison of the AS with related texts, most importantly the YBh, would be a more valuable way to reach a profound understanding than RAHULA's references to Pāli sources (p. 112). SCHMITHAUSEN identifies parallel passages in the *Śrāvakabhūmi* and *Bodhisattvabhūmi* sections of the YBh, as well as in the AKBh (pp. 113-119). He uses the Peking edition for the Tibetan text, and indicates page and line numbers throughout–which I think is wise as Peking is widely available and stemmatically significant. The review article also contains an analysis of the opening verses of the AS (p. 120f.).[187]

1977. Shingyō YOSHIMOTO. "Textual Notes on the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*", *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 50, pp. 18-20.

A comparison of six phrases from the AS in their Tibetan (Peking), Chinese, and retranslated Sanskrit (PRADHAN) versions. YOSHIMOTO points to instances where PRADHAN misrepresents Sanskrit text preserved in the ASBh, or neglected the correct Tibetan reading in favour of an obviously wrong Chinese reading, for example the definition of the term "element" (*dhātu*) at AS 12,13-15: The *rūpaskandha* consists of the ten material elements (five sense faculties and five objects), plus "a part of the *dharmadhātu* (AS_t: *chos kyi khams kyi phyogs gcig*). AS_c here wrongly reads 意界一分, which PRADHAN retranslates as *manodhātvekadeśa*, although the meaning of the phrase "a part of the *dharmadhātu*" is explained in the very next sentence. AS_c accurately reads

---

185 SAKUMA, *Index*, p. 48: "場合によって変更すべき可能性もある".

186 RAHULA, *Compendium*, p. 175,14-18.

187 See my comparison of Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese Outlines, below.

受蘊想蘊行蘊即法界一分.

1983. Lambert SCHMITHAUSEN. "The Darśanamārga Section of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and its Interpretation by Tibetan Commentators (with Special Reference to Bu ston Rin chen grub)." In Ernst STEINKELLNER and Helmut TAUSCHER, eds., *Contributions on Tibetan and Buddhist Religion and Philosophy*, vol. 2. Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, pp. 259-274.

Addressing a primarily Tibetological audience, SCHMITHAUSEN provides an analysis of BU STON's commentary on AS 66,3-68,2 (definitions of the *darśanamārga*), along with a systematic investigation into the sources of the AS exposition. The *darśanamārga* section of the AS is not preserved in the MS.[188] Among the four definitions of the *darśanamārga* provided in the AS, the first one can be traced to the three classical "Yogācāra" treatises the Tibetan tradition ascribes to Maitreya.[189] The second definition stems from the *Śrāvakabhūmi* (although reinterpreted in a Mahāyānist sense in the AS), the third can be traced in the *Viniścayasaṃgrahiṇī*, and the fourth—a basically "Hīnayānist" (i.e. non-Mahāyānist) description of the *darśanamārga*'s four phases—resembles Vaibhāṣika doctrine as recorded in the AKBh. Its interpretation is nonetheless peculiar to the AS, and it is further refined in the ASBh.[190] Those four definitions are arranged systematically, but they are not integrated into a doctrinally coherent system (pp. 261-264). SCHMITHAUSEN has also identified a quotation from the **Yogavibhāga* (ascribed to Maitreya, p. 261, n. 23). The ASBh partly adds interpretative elements that make the definitions more compatible with each other (p. 265). Lengthy quotations from the AS can be found in the *Abhisamayālaṃkārālokā* (p. 259, n. 1), as Haribhadra used the exposition of the AS for his own elaborations on the *darśanamārga* (p. 272).

1987. Lambert SCHMITHAUSEN. *Ālayavijñāna: on the Origin and Early Development of a Central Concept of Yogācāra Philosophy.*

Some sections of the AS contain doctrines that equal those of the *Vastusaṃgrahaṇī*, a section of the YBh that we may safely assume was composed before the integration of *ālayavijñāna* into Yogācāra systematics.[191] This implies that the *Vastusaṃgrahaṇī* does not mention the *ālayavijñāna* also where the context would

---

[188] PRADHAN has wrongly included a section of the ASBh in his retranslation (p. 259).

[189] $AS_{t,D}$ 103b7: *gzung ba dang 'dzin pa mi dmigs [pa]* (=AS 82,18), which is similar to MSg III.24b, a quotation from a **Yogavibhāga* later ascribed to Maitreya. See also SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 260, n. 100.

[190] Note that in the Satyaviniścaya section of the AS, the sixteen aspects of the Four Noble Truths are discussed, which corresponds to the "cataphatic and analytical" (SCHMITHAUSEN, *art.cit.*, p. 264) description of the *darśanamārga*.

[191] Or, by a scholar who did not yet accept the *ālayavijñāna*, or did not want to teach it. See also DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 169 and SAKUMA, *Āśrayaparivṛtti*, p. 166.

necessitate it in "classical" Yogācāra thought (p. 167). The *Savitarkādibhūmi*[192] (of the YBh's *Basic Section*), in contrast, presupposes the *ālayavijñāna*, for example, in its explanations of "*karman* entailing neither pleasant nor painful experience". That kind of *karman* is explained 1.) as immovable *karman* (*aniñjyakarman*), but also 2.) as having *ālayavijñāna* as its ripening ("everywhere", *sarvatra*, i.e. not only from the fourth *dhyāna* on).[193] Although the respective explanation in AS 58,13-14 is completely in agreement with 1.), strikingly anything corresponding to 2.) is missing in the AS parallel.[194] As far as I see, this could either mean that the definition was copied from the *Savitarkādibhūmi* (or, another common source) *before* the sentence mentioning *ālayavijñāna* was added, or otherwise that that sentence was left out on purpose in the AS. SCHMITHAUSEN only alludes to "compilatory features"[195] of the AS (p. 189), but does not go into further detail.

Some sections of the AS refer to doctrines that originated in the three "Maitreya texts" (p. 262, n. 100), still another is based on the Maitreya chapter (*Byams zhus kyi le'u*) contained in the longer *Prajñāpāramitā* sūtras.[196] SCHMITHAUSEN again clearly states his opinion that Sthiramati was not the author of the ASBh (p. 411f., n. 775). The *index locorum* contains a very helpful list of the many AS and ASBh sections treated (p. 661f.).

1989. Paul GRIFFTHS, Noriaki HAKAMAYA, John KEENAN, and Paul SWANSON. *The Realm of Awakening: Chapter Ten of Asaṅga's Mahāyānasaṃgraha*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

This translation and edition of the MSg (chapter ten) is skilfully arranged with parallel passages from other Yogācāra texts, including AS and ASBh. The index lists only the occurrences of the AS and ASBh without indicating page and line numbers. In the main text, references to the AS are made by means of RAHULA's translation (*Compendium*), GOKHALE ("Fragments"), or $AS_{t,D}$, and sometimes AS_c or PRADHAN's edition. Regarding doctrinal aspects, the primary sources have not always been read with the necessary care, as, for example, in the case of the comparison between the explanations of the *saṃskāraskandha* in AS and AKBh at p. 103, n. 58, which is misleading; or the omission of *ālayavijñāna* when rendering the AS definition of the *vijñānaskandha*, p. 104, n. 60.

---

192 I use the term *Savitarkādibhūmi* to refer to the *Savitarkāsavicārābhūmi*, the *Avitarkāvicāramātrābhūmi*, and the *Avitarkāvicārābhūmi*. See KRITZER (*Vasubandhu*, p. xiii, n. 4).

193 YBh 192,7-9: *adukhāsukhavedanīyaṃ karma yat sarvatrālayavijñānavaipākyaṃ karma caturthāc ca dhyānād ūrdhvam āniñjyam*. See also MUROJI, "Āniñjya-karma", p. 131f.

194 $AS_{t,P}$ 105a2: *sdug bsngal yang ma yin bde ba yang ma yin pa myong bar 'gyur ba'i las gang zhe na / bsam gtan gsum po las gong ma'i dge ba'o*. See SCHMITHAUSEN, *ibid.*, pp. 136, 432, n. 876.

195 I put the term "compilatory features" in quotation marks not to show disagreement, but on the contrary because I think it deserves to be treated as a technical term in the study of the AS.

196 On the Maitreya chapter as a "later" interpolation to the *Prajñāpāramitā* sūtras, see BUESCHER, *Vijñānavāda*, p. 19, n. 2.

1996. Hidenori SAKUMA. *Tatia kōteiban* Abidatsumazōshūron *bongo sakuin oyobi korigenda* (タティア校訂版『阿毘達磨雑集論』梵語索引およびコリゲンダ; *Sanskṛt Word-Index to the Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣyam Edited by N. Tatia with the Corrigenda*). Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.

That SAKUMA has composed this very helpful tool for the study of the AS with great care can be seen, for example, in the fact that SAKUMA includes all members of any compound into the alphabetical list consistently. Being an index to TATIA's edition, it includes text from the additional leaf and marginal notations of the MS. Recent research has shown that that is partly ASVy text.[197] The section providing corrigenda (pp. 5-46) to TATIA's edition is of great benefit, although some cases are disputable,[198] and although the Tibetan is not always correct (*sked cig* for *skad cig*, p. 18; *dag* for *ngag*, p. 24). That section contains references to $ASBh_{t,P}$, $ASVy_{t,P}$, and PRADHAN's AS edition. In some cases I am missing references to GOKHALE ("Fragments"), AS_t or $ASBh_{t,D}$, but, as the author states in his introduction, outer circumstances did not allow him to invest more time in his publication. For the corrigenda, SAKUMA also refers to the YBh, SCHMITHAUSEN's *Ālayavijñāna*, and the *Mahāvyutpatti* (SAKAKI's edition).

1999. Robert KRITZER. *Rebirth and Causation in the Yogācāra Abhidharma*. Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien.

f The main purpose of this study is to determine the doctrinal position of the AS concerning origination in dependence (*pratītyasamutpāda*, AS 25,33-26,34). The author refers to closely related materials, especially the *Yogācārabhūmi* and *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, and also to sūtras, the Vinaya, or later Yogācāra texts. According to KRITZER, the *Savitarkādibhūmi* (of the YBh's *Basic Section*) appears to be the main source for the more systematized and refined *pratītyasamutpāda* exposition in the AS. Also the *Daśabhūmikasūtra* contains a closely similar passage, while, in contrast, KRITZER does not see any evidence for a direct Mahīśāsaka origin of that exposition in both AS and ASBh (p. 13).

---

[197] See KRITZER, "Additional Leaf", and my notes on AS 54,3. TATIA (*Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣyam*, p. xxvi) wrongly assumed that some of the margin notations were based on "the Chinese translation", which makes no sense as TATIA (*op.cit.*, p. xxii) was basically aware that "the Chinese translation" (T 1606) is a translation of the ASVy, not the ASBh. This was made clear by BANDURSKI ("Göttinger Sammlungen", p. 57) who related $ASVy_c$ and $ASVy_t$ to "the Chinese translation" mentioned by TATIA.

[198] In the *karman* section, for example, the emendations of *yadbhūyasyā* to *yadbhūyasā* at ASBh 63,10 or of $ASBh_T$ *paṇḍapaṇḍakānāṃ* (=SAKUMA, *op.cit.*, p. 307) to $ASBh_{MS}$ *ṣaṇḍapaṇḍakānāṃ* are missing, and the emendation of *pāruṣāṇām* to *pāruṣyabhāṣaṇam* at ASBh 64,3 (*ibid.*, p. 24) is contestable. Also *ālinatvā* at ASBh 88,6 (*ibid.*,p. 175) should rather read *alinatvā* in accordance with Tibetan *zhum pa med pa* (see CHOI, *Dreifache Schulung*, p. 109, n. 217).

The Section on *Karman* in the Context of the AS

In order to show the role the *karman* section has within the compositional structure of the AS, I would like to present a brief outline, first, by means of a comparison between the outlines found in the Chinese and Tibetan versions, and second, by a more detailed listing of the Chinese outline. For a summary of the whole AS in English, see Paul GRIFFITHS, "Asaṅga, *Abhidharmasamuccaya*", in the *Encyclopaedia of Indian Philosophies*, vol. 8.

Brief Outline of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*

The Tibetan and Chinese versions of the AS differ fundamentally in their translation of the general outline (*spyi sdom, piṇḍoddāna*) in verse, which is found at the very beginning of the text (AS 1,1-6, not preserved in Sanskrit). The outline in AS_t is rather complicated and unbalanced, proposing thirteen sections, the last one having four subdivisions. Those are the four "determinations" (*viniścaya*) which, in turn, make up about two thirds of the AS.[199] Looking into the main text of the AS, one finds a division into five "compilations" (*samuccaya*): The *Lakṣaṇasamuccaya* ([A.], which comprises sections [1.]-[12.]), and the four "determinations" ([B.I-IV.], identical to section [13.]). Each of the five contains the respective "compilation's" title and its ordinal number in the end.[200] The Sanskrit titles of those chapters are preserved in the ASBh, and partially also in the AS MS: AS 35,23 (= GOKHALE, "Fragments", p. 30,16, = ASBh 1,3): *lakṣaṇasamuccayo nāma prathamaḥ samuccayaḥ*, AS 85,13 (= GOKHALE, "Fragments", p. 35,33 = ASBh 95,2): *dharmavini°*. The AS_c divides the first chapter into four subsections ([A.I-IV]), thereby artificially producing the impression of a well-balanced composition,[201] although the structure of the AS hints at a gradual enlargement of the text, rather than a pre-contemplated composition.[202]

---

[199] This estimate is given based upon the page numbers in PRADHAN's edition, which are, unfortunately, slightly misleading as the retranslated sections include XUANZANG's additions, which inflates the text as a whole.

[200] See SCHMITHAUSEN, "Zu Walpola Rahula's Übersetzung", p. 121f. Cf. PRADHAN, *Abhidharma Samuccaya*, p. 9.

[201] RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. xiv) already observed that the separation of the Lakṣaṇasamuccaya into four subsections is quite artificial.

[202] From the point of view of arrangement, the Lakṣaṇasamuccaya with its *pañcaskandhaka* scheme makes quite an archaic impression, followed by the Satyaviniścaya, while the other *viniścaya*s are rather specialized. Still, I cannot present a clear hypothesis in which temporal order the various AS sections were composed (either as part of one work, or, as I tend to assume, some independently). The Lakṣaṇasamuccaya, for example, deals quite openly with the *ālayavijñāna* and covertly with *kliṣṭam manas*, and those do not stick out from the context as later additions. The absence of the "stable forms of mind" in the AS MS ad AS 11,1 (see SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 297, n. 220) is exceptional and rather a scribal error.

An hypothesis on the growth of, for example, the YBh has been formulated by SUGURO (*Shokiyuishiki*, p. 11). Although that hypothesis is built on thorough research, it is only partly

Saying that the structure of the AS is partly lacking balance does not imply that its final redactor was generally lacking organization skills.[203] There may have been external reasons such as time or tradition for the given arrangement of the material. One point that certainly limited the liberty to produce a coherent structure, on a micro level, was the method to open a thematic sub-sections with a sūtra quotation (in the *Satyaviniścaya*), which in turn forced certain subjects on the author he might have otherwise placed elsewhere in the flow of his exposition. Similarly, structuring elements such as the five *skandhas* or the Four Noble Truths were originally taken from sūtras and then filled with quotations from other sūtras that did not primarily aim at explaining those categories. Redactors and scholastics had been trying to organize the sūtras themselves and their doctrines for several centuries before the AS and that was never an easy task. In comparison, the author of the *Abhidharmakośakārikā* structured his text with much less dependence on sūtra elements, which led to more coherence.

Note also that the title of the *Lakṣaṇasamuccaya* is rendered into Chinese by a semantically different term (本事分, "Main Section", "Core Section"), which is similar to the Chinese title of the *Basic Section* (本地分) of the YBh.

FRAUWALLNER ("Abhidharma-Studien: I", p. 32f.) has already begun an enquiry into the origins of this AS *pañcaskandhaka* exposition. Even though I am not convinced that we can trace a particular transmission lineage of *Jñānaprasthāna* doctrines in that section, the the question of possible precursors of the Lakṣaṇasamuccaya is still of great interest. I wonder how much of a transmitted *pañcaskandhaka* exposition the author had before him when he wrote this section, which tradition that *pañcaskandhaka* treatise–if it existed at all–belonged to. Did the author freely modify a Sarvāstivāda text he had received? Did he rely on a text he either brought from the Mahīśāsaka tradition? Or did he make use of a *pañcaskandhaka* treatise that had originated in the somewhere within those scholarly circles that brought forth the "Yogācāra" treatises we nowadays find in the YBh? In either of those three cases, I would like to suggest that the structural imbalance we can observe in the AS was in part caused by the author's close adherence to an original *pañcaskandhaka* that was transmitted independently of an exposition of the Four Noble Truths (such as the Satyaviniścaya). It even seems possible that the Satyaviniścaya and the Lakṣaṇasamuccaya were not originally designed as parts of one treatise but only combined–along with other sections–after they were completed.

---

convincing (see also DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, pp. 206-210). On the gradual enlargement of the ŚrBh, see DELEANU, *op.cit.*, p. 147, on the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, see WANGCHUK, *Resolve*, p. 148.

Comparing the AS or the ŚrBh with the AKBh, one generally finds the latter is structurally more sound. Still, it sometimes makes the appearance of a work-in-progress: It is sometimes not clear, which position Vasubandhu advocates, and the ninth chapter is quite clearly a late addition or appendix.

[203] See also DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 201, n. 2 and p. 209, n. 40.

Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese Outlines: A Comparison

The list below shows how the five sections mentioned in the AS fit together with the verses in Tibetan and Chinese. The Chinese chapter headings are taken from the verse text (AS_c 663a8-11), the Sanskrit headings form the ASBh. XUANZANG has also indicated subdivisions which are ignored here.

AS_t[204]	**AS_c 663a8-11**
[1.] du dang [2.] ci phyir [3.] nyer len dang //	[A.]本事與[B.]決擇是各有四種
[4.] mtshan nyid [5.] de yi rnam gzhag dang //	[A.I]三法[A.II]攝[A.III]應[A.IV]成[B.I]諦[B.II]法[B.III]得[B.IV]論議
[6.] go rim [7.] don dang [8.] dpe [9.] dbye dang //	[1.]幾[2.]何因[3.]取[4.]相[5.]建立與[6.]次第
	[7.]義[8.] 喻[9.]廣分別集總頌應知
bsdus la sogs pa **rnam pa bzhi** //	**AS (Chapter Headings according to ASBh)**
[10.] bsdus dang **[11.] mtshungs ldan [12.] ldan pa** dang //	Lakṣaṇasamuccaya [A.I.1.-12.]
[13.] rnam par nges pa bzhir dbye ste //	Satyaviniścaya [B.I]
bden dang chos 'thob 'bel gtam ni //	Dharmaviniścaya [B.II]
rnam par nges pa'i dbye ba ste //	Prāptiviniścaya [B.III]
kun las btus pa'i spyi sdom yin //	Sāṃkathyaviniścaya [B.IV]

[204] The Tibetan text is edited following SCHMITHAUSEN ("Zu Walpola Rahula's Übersetzung", p. 120), leaving out the remarkable amount of variant readings. It corresponds to $AS_{t,P}$ 51a4-5.

The Single Chapters According to the Chinese Outline

[A.] (本事分)[205] **Lakṣaṇasamuccaya**

[A.I] (三法品) ("Chapter on the Three *dharmas*"[?])

[1.] (幾) Number (of *skandhas*, *dhātus* and *āyatanas*)

[2.] (何因) Reason (for that number)

[3.] (取) Appropriation (of the *skandhas*, and so on)

[4.] (相) Characteristics (of the *skandhas*, etc.)

[5.] (建立) Distinction (i.e., enumeration and definition of the *dharmas* belonging to each *skandha*, etc.)

[6.] (次第) Order (i.e., reasons for the order of the *skandhas*, etc.)

[7.] (義) Meaning (of the words *skandha*, etc.)

[8.] (喻) Comparison (i.e., metaphors for the *skandhas*, etc.)

[9.] (廣分別) Division (i.e., the *skandhas*, etc. analysed through attribute matrices, etc.)

[A.II] (攝品)

[10.] Inclusion (which *dhātu* is included in which *skandha*, etc.)

[A.III] (相應品)

[11.] Association (of the *skandhas*, etc., e.g., the five omnipresent mental factors, etc.)

[A.IV] (成就品)

[12.] Possession (of the seeds for liberation or suffering, of meditative states)

[B.] (決擇分)

[13.] Determination (i.e. writings on related subjects which are difficult to grasp in the *skandha* scheme).

[B.I] (諦品) **Satyaviniścaya** (the Four Noble Truths: 1. Suffering: cosmology, classification of suffering, rebirth, impermanence, etc.; 2. Origination: *kleśa*, *karman*; 3. Cessation: definition, etc., of *nirodha*, its synonyms etc.; 4. path: the five paths)

[B.II] (法品) **Dharmaviniścaya** (explanation of the Buddhist doctrine: the twelvefold and threefold division of the Buddhist canon, its study and practice; *vaipulya*)

---

205 The extensive Chinese headings for the single chapters are inserted from the prose text of AS_c.

[B.III] (得品) **Prāptiviniścaya** (distinction of individuals and analysis of comprehension)

[B.IV] (論議品) **Sāṃkathyaviniścaya** (debate, reasoning)

The Chapter on the Truth of Origination: Subdivisions.

I would like to propose the following division of the chapter on the Truth of Origination (*samudayasatya*, AS 43-62) into four sections:

1. Definition of the Truth of Origination	AS 43
2. *Kleśa*s	AS 43-53
3. *Karman*	AS 53-61
4. The four characteristics of the Truth of Origination[206]	AS 61-62

Among those four, the section on *karman* is translated here. It should be noted that the section of *karman* begins quite abruptly with the phrase "What is *karman*?" In the Chinese version, in contrast, we find the phrase "What are those kinds of *karman* that arise under the influence of the *kleśa*s?"[207], which is actually adopted from the beginning of the *samudayasatya* section.[208] I think it is obvious that XUANZANG here strove to integrate the subject *karman* smoothly within the chapter, while the original author(s) were less concerned with such stylistic features. In the same way, the discussion of the four characteristics of the Truth of Origination starts without any indication that the explanation of *karman* has ended.

Does *Karman* Actually Belong to the Truth of Origination?

Karman has not always been included within the Truth of Origination.[209] The earliest Buddhist texts mentioned only thirst (*tṛṣṇā*) as the cause for suffering.[210] On the

---

[206] Each of the four chapters of the *Satyaviniścaya* ends with the respective set (of four) from the sixteen aspects (*ṣoḍāśākāra*) of the Four Noble Truths. A short section at the end of the Satyaviniścaya (AS 77,9-21) discusses the meaning of the whole list. See also RAHULA, *Compendium*, p. 130, n. 2.

[207] AS_c 678c29: 云何煩惱增上所生諸業. GRIFFITHS ("Asaṅga, *Abhidharmasamuccaya*", p. 441) follows the Chinese version, which is not justified.

[208] AS 43,10 (Sanskrit preserved): *samudayasatyaṃ katamat / kleśaḥ kleśādhipateyañ ca karma //*; $AS_{t,P}$ 92b8: *kun 'byung gi bden pa gang zhe na / nyon mongs pa dang / nyon mongs pa'i dbang gis 'byung ba'i las so //* (≈ $ASVy_{t,P}$ 224b2); AS_c 676a19: 云何集諦。謂諸煩惱及煩惱增上所生諸業 (=$ASVy_c$ 722b17).

[209] The Pāli compound *samudayasacca* probably meant "the Truth 'Origination'" originally (see NORMAN, "Four Noble Truths", p. 386), while the Tibetan equivalent *kun 'byung gi bden pa* indicates that such an understanding of *samudayasatya* did not prevail in the ninth century, and I found no trace of such an understanding in the AS either.

[210] Most commonly known is the passage expounding the Four Noble Truths, allegedly for the first time, in the *Dhammacakkapavattanasutta* (SN V, p. 421). See also FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 5, and BRONKHORST in BUSWELL, ed., *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*,

other hand, the formula of the twelvefold origination in dependence (*pratītyasamutpāda*) was included within the Truth of Suffering[211] although it ends in the phrase "in that way the origin of [this] heap of suffering comes about" (*evam ... duḥkhaskandhasya samudayo bhavati*),[212] although it contains the link *saṃskārāḥ*,[213] and although the Second and Third Noble Truths (i.e., *samudaya* and *nirodha*)[214] are described in terms of the origination in dependence at AN I, p. 177.[215]

In some contexts, the Abhidharma scholars tended to interpret each of the Four Noble Truths as denoting the set of *dharmas* belonging to that respective Noble Truth.[216] That is, I suppose, one of the reasons why *karman* as a whole was occasionally reduced to *cetanā*:[217] *Karman* had not been defined as a *dharma*, so it was identified with *cetanā* to

---

s.v. Karma (Action). For another example for the Truth of Origination described without mention of Karman, see YAMAGUCHI, *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā*, pp. 168,24-169,11. For the role of defilements and origination in dependence in the Truth of Origination, see AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, pp. 41-50, on ignorance in the Truth of Origination, SCHMITHAUSEN, "Liberating Insight", p. 208, on *tṛṣṇā* as the cause of suffering, id., "Spiritual Practice and Philosophical Theory", p. 236, on the triad *kleśa-*, *karma-*, *janma-saṃkleśa* in the YBh, BUESCHER, *Vijñānavāda*, p. 126f., n. 2. See also MUROJI, *Pratītyasamutpādavyākhyā*, PSVy, p. 20, and my notes ad AS 61,3-4 ("*karmayonīyāḥ*").

211 Another example (apart from the AS) for the classical Abhidharma ascription of the first two Truths is the *Abhidharmahṛdaya*, which groups *karman* under the Truth of Origination (along with *anuśaya*) and origination in dependence under the Truth of Suffering. See RYŌSE "*Abhidharmahṛdaya*", p. 37.

212 See ERB, *Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti*, p. 183, n. 825.

213 The AS clearly equates the limb *saṃskārāḥ* with *karman* in the context of our *karman* section (see AS 54,22-55,3). ▪ Already at SN III.60, *cetanā* is used to define *saṃskārāḥ*. Still, *karman* was possibly not the original meaning of the limb *saṃskārāḥ* (its original meaning was probably rather similar to "thirst"), and *karman* as such does not appear in that formula. See SCHMITHAUSEN, "Zur zwölfgliedrigen Formel", p. 65. ▪ In the special exposition of the twelvefold chain of origination in dependence at AS 27,14-16, three limbs *saṃskārāḥ*, *vijñāna*, and *bhava*, are said to fall under the category of *karma(-saṃkleśa*, see AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 44, n. 121), but that doctrine need not affect the identification of *karman* with the *dharma cetanā*. It seems, by the way, to be a rather late doctrine, not found in the YBh (including the SaNiSū), but in Vasubandhu's *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya* (see AHN, *op.cit.*, pp. 44, 50).

214 See also my notes on the appropriation of *nirvāṇa*, ad ASBh 63,9-10.

215 See GUENTHER, *Buddha*, p. 253. GUENTHER (*op.cit.*, p. 256f.) was nonetheless convinced that the *paṭiccasamuppāda* describes only relations (i.e. which events must happen simultaneously), as different from causes. Note that the *ālayavijñāna* is associated with both the First and the Second Noble Truth in the *Viniścayasaṃgrahaṇī* "because it consists of/has all seeds" (*sa bon thams cad pa yin pa'i phyir*). See SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 75 and p. 363, n. 548.

216 For a short discussion of the four compounds ending in "*-satya*", see SAKUMA, *Āśrayaparivṛtti*, vol. 2, p. 95, n. 676 ("das, was in Wahrheit leidvoll ist").

217 See AKBh 195,20f., LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Abhidharmakośa*, vol. 3, p. 3, n. 2 and p. 13f., Hirakawa, *Indian Buddhism*, p. 189, MCDERMOTT, "Karma and Rebirth", p. 185.

make it fit into the *dharma* scheme.[218]

The author of the AS was well aware that the Abhidharma approach of ascribing factors other than thirst to the Truth of Origination was in conflict with the early sūtra teachings, and the issue is discussed in the beginning of the section on the Truth of Origination.[219] There, the author defines the Truth of Origination as defilements, and the action (*karman*) that comes about due to defilements.[220] The author then quotes the *Dharmacakrapravartanasūtra*'s definition ("thirst"), which he classifies as an "explanation according to importance" (*pradhānyanirdeśa*), and he explains "importance" by demonstrating how important the factor "thirst" is as a whole. The rhetorical device employed here is quite simple: Rather than establishing the questionable Abhidharma approach of placing the *kleśa* and *karman* under the Truth of Origination, that placement is simply presupposed, and only the sūtra approach is established by reasoning. It is not the deviance of Abhidharma from the sūtra that is discussed, but rather why the sūtra differs from the Abhidharma.

The Section on *Karman*: Structure

Looking at the contents of the *karman* section, one does not gain the impression of a balanced, pre-contemplated structure or line of argument. In his outline of the AS, GRIFFITHS ("Asaṅga, *Abhidharmasamuccaya*", p. 441f.), states that the section begins with a definition of *karman*, and then continues with a "long series of sūtra quotations" that are lined up without an easily discernible superstructure. In contrast to that, some of the Tibetan commentaries, for example those of RGYAL TSHAB RJE, DPANG LO, and BU STON, contain detailed "outlines of contents" (*sa bcad*) that ascribe more compositional balance to the text. I will now present and evaluate the outline from RGYAL TSHAB RJE's commentary, and then add my own opinion on the structure of the *karman* section.

The most outstanding points of RGYAL TSHAB RJE's outline can be seen below. The numbering of passages stems from the edition by the Tōyō Bunko Chibetto Kenkyūshitsu (*Sa bcad of rJe yab sras gsung 'bum*), where the section on the Truth of Origination is labeled L, which makes karman L2, and the first point within that section M1.

M1	Question (What is *karman*?)
M2	Answer

[218] Another solution was to define some aspects of *karman* as the perceptible bodily and vocal actions (*kāya-* and *vāgvijñapti*) as well as "that which does not make anything known" (the *avijñapti*), whence those aspects could be classifed as matter (*rūpa*).

[219] AS 43,10-14, Sanskrit preserved.

[220] The roles of defilements and *karman* in the origin and the abandonment of *saṃsāra* are discussed, e.g. in Sthiramati's *Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa-vaibhāṣya* (*'khor ba'i rgyu ni las dang nyon mongs pa rnams so /*, P 5567, fol. 52b4). See PAHLKE, *Vijñāna-Abschnitt des Pañcaskandhaka*, pp. 95-99. The **Mahāvibhāṣā* 397b2f. ascribes the view that *karman* and defilements make up the Truth of Origination to the Dārṣṭāntikas (譬喻者說[...]業煩惱是集諦). See AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 41, n. 110).

M2N1	Short explanation
M2N1O1	Two kinds of *karman* (intention, after having intended)
M2N1O2	Five kinds of action
M2N2	Extensive explanation
M2N2O1	"Explaining the Characteristics of *Karman* as They Are"
M2N2O2	"Establishing the Object for the Accurate Consideration..."

Analysis of RGYAL TSHAB RJE's Outline

According to RGYAL TSHAB RJE, the section begins with the question "What is *karman*?", which is structurally at the first layer within the section (layer M in the Tōyō Bunko edition). Layer M consists of two parts: the above-mentioned question (M1), and the entire remainder of the *karman* section, which RGYAL TSHAB RJE considers to be the answer (M2). The answer, in turn, consists of firstly a short explanation (N1), that is, *karman* is intention and that which follows intention (O1) and the five kinds of action (O2), and secondly an extensive explanation (N2). Now, the biggest part of the *karman* section consists of the extensive explanation (N2), and it is there that the "long series of sūtra quotations" (GRIFFITHS) is arranged.

RGYAL TSHAB RJE divides the "extensive explanation" (N2, corresponding to AS 53,6-61,19) into two main parts. The first, "Explaining the Characteristics of *Karman* as They Are" (O1, *las kyi mtshan nyid ji ltar gnas par bshad pa*) includes everything up to the explanation that "the conduct of the noble disciple is without regret" (AS 60,21-22). The second part (O2) includes only the sūtra quotation that "beings are heirs to their *karman*", and so on, and the explanations on what is "inconceivable" (*acintya*). That second part carries the somewhat strange title "The Characteristics of *Karman*: Establishing the Object for the Accurate Consideration of Those Classifications" (*las kyi mtshan nyid ni / dbye ba de dag tshul bzhin yid la byed pa'i dmigs pa bzhag pa*).

So far, RGYAL TSHAB RJE's outline appears quite helpful, but it is partly interpretative rather than describing the original plan of the AS author. Of course, it makes sense to understand the whole *karman* section to be an answer to the question "What is *karman*?", but I see no evidence that that was the AS's author's intention. Another example of the interpretative character of the outline is the title "Establishing the Object for Accurate Consideration..." (for section O2), which is not found in the AS or in an Indian commentary and for which RGYAL TSHAB RJE provides no explanation. It is certainly remarkable that those two fundamental sūtra passages stating that "beings are heirs to their *karman*" and that "*karman* is inconceivable" are placed at the end of the *karman* section. My own interpretation is that the sūtra passage "heirs to their *karman*..." is, on the one hand, a must for any Abhidharma exposition of *karman*, while, on the other hand, it does not add anything substantial to what has been said before. That ancient passage, emphasizing the importance of *karman* with some poetical appeal, is placed in an exalted position in the end of the section to provide some sort of climax, or summary,

for what has been said before.[221] The sūtra passage "*karman* is inconceivable" then adds a whole new turn to the previous explanation of *karman*, for it partly devalues the attempt to rationally explain *karman*. And I think there is another reason for placing the "inconceivable" passage in the end: The list of the Ten Kinds of Control adds a strong Mahāyāna element to the *karman* section, which has up to then been totally acceptable to non-Mahāyānists.

A closer look at the section "Explaining the Characteristics of *Karman* as They Are" (section M2N2O1) reveals that RGYAL TSHAB RJE rightly divides it into 1) the section giving further explanations on intention and what has been intended (*cetanā*, *cetayitvā*) and the ten paths of action (M2N2O1P1, AS 53,6-14), and 2) the discussion of various aspects of *karman* (M2N2O1P2, AS 53,15-60,22) up to "heirs of their *karman*", which contains most of the "long series of sūtra quotations".

M2N2O1	Explaining the Characteristics of *Karman* as They Are
M2N2O1P1	Explaining Briefly *Karman* That Is Indention and Intended *Karman*
M2N2O1P2	Explaining Extensively the Meaning of Those Two
M2N2O1P2Q1	Explaining Those Two by Means of Enumerations
M2N2O1P2Q2	Explaining by Means of the Distinctions of *Karman*
M2N2O1P2Q3	Explaining *Karman* That Is to Be Adopted in Detail

RGYAL TSHAB RJE sees three major subdivisions in section P2: 1) "Explaining Those Two [Kinds of *Karman*] by Means of Enumerations" (*las gnyis po de nyid rnam grangs kyis bshad pa*, M2N2O1P2Q1, AS 53,15- AS 57,2), 2) "Explaining by Means of the Distinctions of *Karman*" (*las kyi rab tu dbye ba'i sgo nas bshad pa*, Q2, AS 57,3-59,11), and 3) "Explaining *Karman* That Is to Be Adopted in Detail" (*blang bya'i las bye brag tu bshad pa*, Q3, AS 59,13-60,22). Of those subdivisions, the one between Q1 ("Enumerations") and Q2 ("Distinctions") appears to me to be highly artificial. Both sections equally contain what can, to my knowledge, be rightly called "enumerations" or "distinctions" and it seems as if RGYAL TSHAB RJE here sees more compositional balance than there actually is.[222] As for the distinction between Q3 ("*Karman* That is to be Adopted") and Q1 and Q2, there certainly is a fundamental difference: While Q1 and Q2

221 With the same effect, a poem on the inevitability of *karman* is placed, e.g., in the end of the *karman* section of SGAM PO PA's *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan* (p. 65). See GUENTHER, *Jewel Ornament*, p. 83.

222 There is an odd mistake in RGYAL TSHAB RJE's outline: The discussion of common *karman* is wrongly listed as a subsection (R3S2T1) to the section on the three kinds of impulses (R3). Then, the discussion of common and individual *karman* (R4S1) is correctly mentioned as subordinate to the section which discusses common and individual, as well as strong and weak *karman* (R4). RGYAL TSHAB RJE wrongly mentions no subsections to R4S1, so it is quite clear that the discussion of common *karman* is misplaced in the outline as R3S2T1, while it should actually be R4S1T1. See AS-rGyal-tshab, pp. 751,4 and 752,3-6.

mainly discuss systematical issues on the workings of *karman*, such as the various kinds of result, etc., section Q3 presents sūtra passages on giving, as well as on discipline. Both are more "archaic" issues in Buddhist thought in so far as the discipline of the monastic order, as well as the donations of the laity, were of fundamental importance for the survival of the order, and their exposition for pragmatic purposes is thus quite different from scholastic elaborations on *karman*. As far as I have identified the sūtra quotations of Q3, they do not stem from passages that primarily expound *karman*. On the level below Q, we find the sections marked by the single sūtra quotations. Those are simply lined up and we find no clues on their superstructure on this level of the outline.

My Outline

I will now present my own outline. Some remarks on how the passages fit together can be seen in the footnotes.

AS 53,3-14	Definition of *karman*, twofold, fivefold. The twofold explanation subdivided (body, speech, and mind). The threefold definition subdivided (ten paths of action). The ten paths of action subdivided (five aspects).[223]
AS 53,15-20	Intentionality: Restrictions to the definition of *karman*.[224]
AS 54,1-2	*Karman* that is certainly to be experienced.[225]
AS 54,3-10	Three kinds of fruits of wholesome and unwholesome actions.
AS 54,11-14	*Karman* that entails and fulfils. One or many actions entail one or many existences.
AS 54,15-18	The order of ripening.[226]
AS 54,19-21	Meritorious, demeritorious, and immovable action.[227]
AS 54,22-55,3	The impulses are based on ignorance.

[223] This section is a well-structured introduction into the subject of *karman*.

[224] From this point on, the structure of the *karman* section appears somewhat arbitrary. The explanations on intentionality form a valuable, but not absolutely necessary supplement to the doctrine that *karman* is intention.

[225] In the previous section, certain instances where *karman* is necessarily to be experienced are mentioned. Placing the explanations on *niyatavedanīyaṃ karman* here appears rather associative, but still the doctrine that the results of *karman* are not lost is of central importance in the Buddhist dogma.

[226] These explanations, and those of the above passage are well-placed here to complete the teachings on the fruit of ripening.

[227] Three important terms of Buddhist *karman* doctrine are introduced here. I see no connection to the previous passage, and one may wonder why they appear relatively late in the text. However that may be, their introduction is preliminary for the following phrase from the formula of origination in dependence.

AS 55,4-9	Defilements for preparation and completion of unwholesome actions.[228]
AS 55,10-56,8	Common and individual *karman*, strong and weak *karman*.[229]
AS 56,9-57,2	Action and result are not similar.
AS 57,3-58,9	Restraint, non-restraint and neither-restraint-nor-non-restraint.
AS 58,11-14	Three kinds of *karman*: to be experienced as pleasure, suffering, neither pleasure nor suffering.
AS 58,15-59,4	Three kinds of *karman*: to be experienced in this lifetime, in the next lifetime, later.
AS 59,5-13	Four kinds of *karman*: black, white, etc.[230]
AS 59,13-21	The action of giving: various aspects.
AS 60,1-6	The discipline of a monk.[231]
AS 60,6-22	"Restrained with body and speech", etc.: Pphrases on monastic discipline.[232]
AS 60,23-61,7	Sūtra Quotation: "Beings Have *Karman* as their Own, etc."[233]
AS 61,8-19	*Karman* as unthinkable. [234]

[228] That unwholesome actions are preceded by defilements resembles the doctrine that impulses are based on ignorance. Still, its placement appears rather arbitrary, and it is astonishing that this doctrine has not been explained in the context of the five aspects of the ten paths of action (AS 53,13-14). The ASBh comment ad AS 53,13-14 clearly states that, e.g., killing can be induced by "greed, hatred, and delusion–as appropriate–either combined or separate".

[229] Concerning this passage and the following five, I see no systematic reasons for arranging them in this order. The arrangement may have been copied from an older Abhidharma work.

[230] The series of lists on the workings of *karman* ends here. The following passages do not deal with *karman* directly, but with donations, and with monastic discipline.

[231] I find it quite reasonable, that the discipline of a monk is discussed in this place even though many doctrines of the *karman* section are primarily concern lay followers. It is the asceticism of the monk that makes him a worthy recipient of a layman's offering. These two sections, on giving and on discipline, mainly deal with the two participants in the act of giving, the donor and the recipient of donations.

[232] The AS here contains no longer sūtra quotation. The ASBh provides a short introduction to this unusual AS passage: "Hereafter, the meaning of what has been pointed out by the Bhagavat in other sūtras, [i.e.] 'he is restrained with body and speech', and so on, is explained."

[233] As stated above, I assume this sūtra quotation was placed near the end of the *karman* section as a sort of summary, or climax.

[234] As I stated above, this passage adds a whole new Mahāyānistic turn to the *karman* section. It was probably placed in the end so that non-Mahāyānistic might have gained some acceptance of the text before reaching here.

The Section on *karman*: Previous Research

Editions

The fragmentary (GOKHALE, "Fragments") and complete editions of the AS, ASBh, and ASVy have been mentioned above. A separate edition of the section on *karman* has not yet been undertaken, so the state of research remains unsatisfactory in many respects.

Translations and Studies

The French translation by Walpola RAHULA (ultimately based on AS_c), and the Japanese one by Daijō TOKIWA and Yūki REIMON (based on $ASVy_c$) remain unsatisfactory. Sara BOIN-WEBB's English translation (ASAṅGA, *Compendium*) closely follows RAHULA. Unfortunately it seems that the above-mentioned M.A. thesis by Shigeho OKADA is not meant to be published. There is therefore no satisfactory translation available.

Among the studies that draw on parts of the section on *karman* are Lambert SCHMITHAUSEN's *Ālayavijñāna* (see the overview, *ibid.*, p. 662), Robert KRITZER's "Unthinkable Matters", summarizing ASBh 73,4-7, "Additional Leaf" deals with the ASVy leaf that is included in TATIA's edition of the ASBh 65,7-26.[235]

[235] A PhD thesis by Fenja HEUPERS ("Foundation of Buddhist Ethics") which passed at the University of Amsterdam in 1985 hugely consists of photocopies of PRADHAN's edition and RAHULA's translation of the *karman* section. HEUPERS displays no working knowledge of any Asian language and she is unaware of the existence of either ASBh or ASVy. I would like to be brief about this thesis and refer the interested reader to it directly.

Textual Witnesses

The original Sanskrit text of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* is only partly available in the form of photographs of a fragmentary manuscript. Those have been edited by GOKHALE (*Fragments*, see also the annotated bibliographical list above). The section on *karman* is unfortunately not preserved in Sanskrit, so only certain Sanskrit words and phrases can be retrieved from the Indian commentary *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*: That commentary is completely preserved in a Sanskrit MS, critically edited by TATIA (*Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣyaṃ* see also the annotated bibliographical list above). In addition, Tibetan and Chinese versions of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and the *Abhidharmasamuccayavyākhyā* exist. The latter is a combination of the AS and the ASBh, matching the instructions of the AS with the respective explanations of the ASBh in one text, with occasional minor additions.[236] No Chinese translation of the ASBh as such exists, although one has been prepared in Tibetan.[237] Pralhad PRADHAN's edition of the AS contains the text of the fragmentary *Abhidharmasamuccaya* MS as well as PRADHAN's own retranslation of the missing parts in Sanskrit. Normally, PRADHAN follows the Chinese version (with reference to Tibetan) and supplies terminology from the ASBh MS. PRADHAN's retranslation proved of little value for my approximate reconstruction.

Sanskrit		Tibetan	Chinese
Abhidharmasamuccaya (AS)	fragments: edited by GOKHALE (1947); fragments + retranslation: edited by PRADHAN (1950)	*Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa* (AS_t)	大乘阿毘達磨集論 (AS_c)
Abhidharma-samuccayabhāṣya (ASBh)	edited by TATIA (1976)	*Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i bshad pa* ($ASBh_t$)	not extant
Abhidharma-samuccavyākhyā (ASVy)	mostly not extant; fragments visible in the ASBh MS; those are often included in TATIA's edition	*Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i rnam par bshad pa* ($ASVy_t$)	大乘阿毘達磨雜集論 ($ASVy_c$)

---

[236] The ASVy also contains a kind of preamble (see OKADA, "Jobun"), as well a complete passage of very popular explanations on the three fruits of *karman* (see KRITZER, "Additional Leaf"). See also SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 572.

[237] With the ASVy available, the Chinese translators probably saw no need for a separate ASBh translation.

Overview: The Passage on *Karman*: Various Textual Witnesses

Abhidharmasamuccaya

- Sanskrit retranslation: PRADHAN, ed., *Abhidharma Samuccaya*, pp. 53,3-61,19.
- Tibetan:

  $AS_{t,P}$: P 5550, vol. 112, fols. *li* 101a5-107a8.

  $AS_{t,N}$: N 3541, fols. *li* 92b1-98a2.

  $AS_{t,G}$: G 3549, vol. 65, fols. *li* 112a6-119b2.

  $AS_{t,D}$: D 4049, TAKASAKI, et al., eds., *Sems-tsam*, vol. 12, fols. *ri* 81a5-90a6.[238]

  $AS_{t,C}$: vol. 55, fols. *ri* 85a5-90a6.

  NAKAMURA (*Indian Buddhism*, p. 267) mentions also a publication by Ōtani University in four fascicles.

- Chinese: T 1605, vol. 31, pp. 678c29-681b15.

Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya

- Sanskrit:

  TATIA, ed., *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣyam*, pp. 63,6-74,3 (§§ 62-78)

  $ASBh_{MS}$: fols. 57a1-66b6.

- Tibetan:

  $ASBh_{t,P}$: P 5554, vol. 113, fols. *shi* 57a1-66a6.

  $ASBh_{t,N}$: N 3545, fols. *shi* 51a2-60b4.

  $ASBh_{t,G}$: G 3553, vol. 65, fols. *shi* 65b1-77a5

  $ASBh_{t,D}$: D 4053, TAKASAKI, et al., eds., *Sems-tsam*, vol. 13, fols. *li* 45b2-53b1.

  $ASBh_{t,C}$: vol. 56, fols. *li* 48a7-56b2.

Abhidharmasamuccayavyākhyā

- Sanskrit: Additional leaf and margin notations in TATIA (*ibid.*) and $ASBh_{MS}$.[239]
- Tibetan:

---

[238] $AS_{t,D}$ contains a double pagination, one indicating the folio numbers within the *bstan 'gyur* volume (*ri*), and the other indicating the folio numbers within the AS itself.

[239] See KRITZER, "Additional Leaf" and my notes on AS 54,3.

ASVy$_{t,P}$: P 5555, vol. 113, fols. *shi* 239a5-254a3.

ASVy$_{t,G}$: G 3554, vol. 65, fols. *shi* 299b2-319b4.

ASVy$_{t,N}$: N 3546, fols. *shi* 229b7-244b5.

ASVy$_{t,D}$: D 4054, TAKASAKI, et al., eds., *Sems-tsam*, vol. 13, fols. *li* 198b7-211a1.

ASVy$_{t,C}$: vol. 56, fols. *li* 196b6-210a5.

• Chinese: T 1606, vol. 31, pp. 727a29-733a 6.

The Text of the Abhidharmasamuccaya

Sanskrit Text of the AS

An incomplete manuscript of the AS was photographed in Zhwa-lu monastery in the course of Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana's second expedition to Tibet (1934).[240] It is mentioned as an incomplete MS in DGE 'DUN CHOS 'PHEL's list of Indian MSS preserved in the Ri-phug hermitage of Zhwa-lu monastery.[241] The negatives of Sāṅkṛtyāyana's photographs are preserved in the K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, Patna, while the original MS seems to be in Beijing.[242] It was probably among the MSS that were sent to the Chinese Minorities' Library in Beijing in 1961.[243]

The Sanskrit text was first edited in 1947 by V.V. GOKHALE ("Fragments from the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*"), dates the script to the middle of the eleventh century (*ibid.*, p. 13).[244] A later correction on the MS is written in proto-Bengali "of which Bühler reproduces [...] examples belonging to the eleventh and twelfth centuries" (*ibid.*). The MS contains orthographical peculiarities "some of which may [...] originat[e] in a Bengali [...]

---

240 See also PRADHAN, *Abhidharma Samuccaya*, p. 5. On the textual witnesses for the AS, see TSUKAMOTO, et al., *Ronshohen*, pp. 348-350 and MARTIN, *Tibskrit*, s.v. *Abhidharmasamuccaya.*

241 DGE 'DUN CHOS 'PHEL, *gTam rgyud gser gyi thang ma*, p. 15: "*abhidharmasamuccaya: mngon pa kun btus ma tshang ba*". On Ri phug (sometimes spelled Ri sbug), see also DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, pp. 51 and 64, n. 7.

242 See BANDURSKI, "Göttinger Sammlungen", p. 56, and HU-VON HINÜBER, "Sanskrit Manuscript", p. 301.

243 For the history of those MSS, see STEINKELLNER, *Sanskrit Manuscripts in Tibet*, p. 20f., and DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 51f. In the case of the *Śrāvakabhūmi* MS, the MS photographed by Sāṅkṛtyāyana in Zhwa lu Ri phug in 1938 is identical to that stored in the Minorities' Library in Beijing. See DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 65f., n. 16 (I translate 民族 as "minority" a bit euphemistically, lacking a better equivalent. "Ethnic group" would be too narrow and technical.). On the history of the Zhwa-lu MS of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, see WANGCHUK, *Resolve*, p. 359f. Formerly kept in Beijing, it has been transferred to the Nor bu gling ka, Lha sa.

244 According to PRADHAN (*Abhidharma Samuccaya*, p. 7f.) the characters used in the MS are similar to those of "the Nepalese" MSS. He tentatively dates the text to the first half of the eleventh century.

pronunciation."[245]

In 1950, Pralhad PRADHAN published the Sanskrit text again. In order to make up for the missing sections, he included retranslations from the Chinese which he counter-checked with the Tibetan sNar-thang edition. The edition as well as the retranslations were unsatisfactory, as was remarked upon in review articles on Walpola RAHULA's translation into French by J.W. DE JONG ("Compendium", 1973, see the annotated bibliographical list above), S. YOSHIMOTO ("Compendium", 1973), and L. SCHMITHAUSEN ("Walpola Rahulas Übersetzung", 1976, see above). Walpola RAHULA based his translation of the AS (RAHULA, *Compendium*) on this edition. He occasionally proposes improvements to the Sanskrit text. In the section on *karman*, such proposals are rare and of no great value, as RAHULA did not consult the AS_t.

There also exists an unpublished master's thesis by Shigeho OKADA, which contains Japanese translations of (or from?) both the AS and the ASBh,[246] as well as corrigenda to the Sanskrit text. This was used by Hidenori SAKUMA when he compiled his Sanskrit word-index to the ASBh.[247]

Recently, a project headed by Osamu HAYASHIMA has published an electronic version of the AS, ASBh, and ASVy texts.[248] Professor HAYASHIMA kindly informed me that the aim of this project was not a philological re-edition of the whole text but rather to reproduce the available editions in an easily accessible format. Another electronic edition of the AS is available from the project "Digital Sanskrit Buddhist Canon".[249]

AS_t: Tibetan Text of the AS

According to the colophons,[250] the Tibetan translation[251] is ascribed to Jinamitra,[252] Śīlendrabodhi and Ye shes sde. GOKHALE ("Rare Manuscript", p. 209)

---

[245] GOKHALE, "Rare Manuscript", p. 212". DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 55) suggests a distinction between, among others, the "proto-Vartula" script (e.g. the ŚrBh MS) and Vartula-Newāri proper. Among those, Vartula Newāri seems to be closely related to "Proto-Bengali-cum-Maithili" (*ibid.*, p. 69, n. 43) which may have been used in Vikramaśīla Monastery (*ibid.*, p. 57).

[246] "His master's thesis which included Japanese translations of the *AS* and *ASbh*" SAKUMA, *Index* , p. ix. 修士論文で『阿毘達磨集論』『阿毘達磨雑集論』の邦訳研究をされた (*ibid.*, p. vi).

[247] *Ibid*, p. ix.

[248] URL: http://www.shiga-med.ac.jp/public/yugagyo/AS.html.

[249] URL: http://www.uwest.edu/sanskritcanon/Sastra/Roman/sastra82/Sa-82R-1.html.

[250] See also TAKASAKI, et al., *Sems-tsam*, vol. 12, "Contents", p. 1.

[251] *Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa* (D 4049, P 5550, N 3541).

[252] It is actually not clear whether the alleged AS translator Jinamitra (TBRC-P3396) is identical to the Jinamitra said to be a disciple of Pūrṇavardhana. See DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 264, n. 4. As for a possible confusion between Jinaputra, the YBh commentator, and the translator Jinamitra, the former must have lived at the time of, or rather before, XUANZANG (602-664), and the latter in the eighth, well into the ninth centuries. BU STON notes that some held the two translators

assumes a date of 814 for the AS translation by those three translators. I do not know any evidence to support that dating, but since the AS is entered in the Lhan-dkar-ma catalogue, some translation of it should have existed already in the early ninth century.

JINAMITRA and ŚĪLENDRABHODHI to be PŪRṆAVARDHANA's disciples, but BU STON himself was doubtful about this. See DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 73.

AS$_c$: Chinese Text of the AS

The Chinese translation was prepared under Xuanzang (T 1605) in the seventh century.[253] It is highly accurate from a philological point of view and it contains additional explicative elements that have no referent in the original text—a feature often met with in XUANZANG's translations.[254] As for the *karman* section, nearly all such elements can be traced to the ASBh.

The Text of the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*

What follows are some remarks on the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the ASBh. There is no separate Chinese translation, but ASVy$_c$ (see below) contains almost the complete text of the ASBh.

Sanskrit Text of the ASBh

The manuscript of the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* (ASBh) was photographed in Ngor monastery by R. Sāṅkṛtyāyana (negatives preserved in Patna).[255] Prints from those negatives are preserved at the University of Göttingen,[256] where I kindly obtained a complete set of scans. According to GOKHALE (*Fragments*, p. 13), the MS of the ASBh was written by the scribe Panditavaidya-śrī-Amaracandra [sic]. The title *vaidya* could indicate that the scribe was from the Kathmandu valley, as scholars of Newar Buddhism are often physicians (*vaidya*), too.[257] GOKHALE dates the script, without naming it, to approximately the thirteenth century AD.[258] Although SĀṄKṚTYĀYANA had previously characterized the script as "Māghadhī", TATIA (*Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣyam*, p. xxi) says it should be properly called "Proto-Maithilī", unfortunately without providing any arguments in support of his thesis.[259]

---

[253] According to PRADHAN, this was done in 652 CE. PRADHAN (1950, p. 5).

[254] DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, 109f.) praises the accuracy of XUANZANG's translations and discusses his method in more detail.

[255] A handwritten note by Sāṅkṛtyāyana refers to the text as "Abhisa.sa.ṭī", which seems to stand for "Abhidharmasamuccayaṭīka" or even "Abhisamayasamuccayaṭīka", which is Sāṅkṛtyāyana's rendering of *Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i bshad pa*, the title of ASBh$_t$. See BANDURSKI, "Göttinger Sammlungen", p. 56, n. 165.

[256] Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen.

[257] Personal communication by Iain SINCLAIR, Hamburg 2008. Also the punctuation and the scribal peculiarities of the MS conform to some Newar MSS. Id.

[258] That dating is accepted, without comment, by BANDURSKI ("Göttinger Sammlungen", p. 56, n. 164).

[259] I could not get into palaeography deep enough for a competent judgement, but it seems that the classification is aggravated by the fact that scholars who had studied in Vikramaśīla monastery were active in the Kathmandu Valley, especially in the years after the monasteries' destruction around 1200. On the date and location of proto-Bengali MSS, see also EJIMA, *Dhātunirdeśa*, p. viif., and BANDURSKI, *Göttinger Sammlungen*, pp. 19-21.

It seems that a manuscript of the ASBh is currently preserved in the "Center for Research in the Study of China's Tibet". According to MARTIN (*Tibskrit*, pp. 435, 913f.), a catalogue of MSS[260] lists a work with the Tibetan title *mNgon pa kun las btus pa'i 'grel pa*. Although that quite surely refers to the ASBh, the Sanskrit title is given as *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣyataḥsākathyaviniścayanāma*, which is wrongly derived from the final lines of the MS.[261] Also based on the last line, the catalogue wrongly ascribes this work to Amaracandra (Tib. 'Chi med zla ba), who is actually the scribe.[262] The future will show whether the MS mentioned in the catalogue is identical to the ASBh MS photographed by Sāṅkṛtyāyana.

LÜ CHENG (Enc.Bud., s.v. *Abhidharmasamuccaya*) also refers to an AS commentary by a certain *Suddhācandra. The source of that reference is not known to me. Although it is improbable, this could be another wrong ascription of the ASBh to Amaracandra (Tib. 'Chi med zla ba), the name Amaracandra being misread by a Tibetan author as *Amalacandra, translated as *Dri med zla ba and wrongly retranslated as *Śuddhacandra.

Some Features of the ASBh MS

There is one instance in which the Ngor MS of the ASBh differs from $ASBh_t$, but accords to $ASVy_c$: The text of ASBh 68,12-13 has no equivalent in $ASBh_t$, but is fully rendered in $ASVy_c$. Nonetheles, this may well be an error in the original ASBh translation, for the passage is difficult and full of repetitions.

- Orthography: Certain scribal peculiarities, like double consonant after *r* (*vitarkka* instead of *vitarka*) appear.

- Punctuation: *Daṇḍa*s, and *anusvāras* are often left out or illegible on the MS. In the case of a missing *daṇḍa*, *sandhi* rules have often not been applied by the scribe. Sometimes a hardly visible dot (that could be a later addition) is found in place of a *daṇḍa*.[263]

- *Sandhi*: In contrast to the YBh MS (see AYMORÉ, *Karma*, p. 3) , *sandhi* before *a°* is normally executed in the ASBh MS. In both the ASBh and YBh MSS, *avagraha*s are generally missing.

- Margin notations: The ASBh MS contains corrections as well as additions from the

---

260 *Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig zhib 'jug lte gnas su nyar ba'i ta la'i lo ma'i bstan bcos (spyin shog 'dril ma'i par) kyi dkar chag mdor gsal.*

261 The MS ends: *ity abhidharmasamuccaye bhāṣyataḥ sāṃkathyaviniścayo nāma pañcamaḥ samuccayaḥ samāptaḥ // likhāpitam idaṃ paṇḍitavaidyasrīamaracandreṇa jagadbuddhatva-saṃpade // iti* ($ASBh_{MS}$ *pade // iti*; $ASBh_{Pradhan}$ *pada iti*) /, ASBh 156,27-29. See also RAHULA, *Compendium*, p. 186, n. 12.

262 For more sources on Amaracandra, see MARTIN, *Tibskrit*, p. 435.

263 Robert KRITZER ("'Additional Leaf,'" p. 471) has shown that some parts of the text on the MS are a later addition. He assumes that, for good reasons, also for a "faint smudge" on fol. 59a (see my notes on ASBh 65,2).

ASVy in the margin, preferable the upper and lower ones. See also Robert KRITZER's article on the "Additional Leaf".

- TATIA (*Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣyam*, p. xxvi) has changed certain scribal peculiarities, like double consonant after *r* (*vitarkka* instead of *vitarka*) into Pāṇinean standard.

ASBh$_t$: Tibetan Text of the ASBh

As in the case of the AS, the Tibetan translation of the ASBh is ascribed to Jinamitra, Śīlendrabodhi and Ye shes sde. The text is generally in agreement with the ASBh MS. A notable exception is ASBh 64,26, where all Tibetan versions read *rgyur gyur pa* (ASBh$_{t,P}$ 58b4) for *saṃtānapariṇāma*.

Compliance with the Sanskrit Text: The Peking Edition in comparison to the sDe-dge Edition

In order to judge the reliability of the two main branches of the Tibetan *bstan-'gyur* editions, I compare the Peking edition of ASBh$_t$ with the sDe-dge edition.[264] In most of the cases where the readings of those two editions differ, the difference lies in subtleties of the Tibetan language, such as the inclusion or exclusion of the particle *ni* or a final *ba'o* versus a final *bo*. Unfortunately, the particles *kyis* and *kyi* are often mixed up by Tibetan scribes or editors, which makes them less useful for determining which of the Tibetan editions is closer to the Sanskrit text. I found only few significant variants for that purpose, and I have listed those in the chart below. The more accurate reading is set in bold.

Skt	P	D
ASBh 63,10-11 (*prāptikāritrakarmaṇor*).	***'thob pa dang / byed pa'i las***	*'thob par byed pa'i las*
ASBh 63,15 (*asattvasaṃkhyātam*)	*sems gyi grangs su ma gtogs pa*[265]	***sems can gyi grangs su ma gtogs pa***
ASBh 63,18-19 (*tena tena ... tatkālam*)	***de dang des de'i dus***	*de dang de'i dus*[266]
ASBh 64,3 (*bhedya*)	*che bar*[267]	***phye bar***
ASBh 64,16 (*akuśalamūlaiḥ lobhādibhir*)	***mi dge ba'i rtsa ba chags pa la sogs pas***	*mi dge ba'i rtsa ba la chags pa la sogs pas*
ASBh 66,7 (*anekam ākṣipati*)	*du ma'i 'phen pa*	***du ma 'phen pa***

---

[264] As Sanskrit MSS of AS and ASVy do not exist, I chose to scrutinize the ASBh only.

[265] I consider this the more ancient, but inaccurate, *lectio difficilior*.

[266] This seems to be an inaccurate simplification by an editor who did not refer to the Sanskrit text.

[267] This mistake applies to the whole PNG branch.

ASBh 66,18 (*puṇyāniṃjyās*)	***bsod nams dang mi g.yo ba rnams***	*bsod nams dang ye shes* [268] *mi g.yo ba rnams*
ASBh 67,8 (*karmaṇaḥ*)	***las bas***	*las*[269]
ASBh 67,10 (*akuśalād*)	***mi dge ba bas***	*mi dge bas*[270]
ASBh 67,13 (*pūrvābhyastaṃ*)	***sngon goms par byas pa***[271]	*sngon gyi goms par byas pa*
ASBh 67,15 (*ānuddhāryatvāt*)	***dbyung du med pa'i phyir***	*byung du med pa'i phyir*[272]
ASBh 67,21 (*°prasāda°*)	*dad pa*[273]	***dang ba***
ASBh 68,2-4 (*sahaduḥkhena sahadaurmanasyena*)	***sdug bsngal dang bcas shing yid mi bde ba dang bcas par***	*sdug bsngal dang bcas par*[274]
ASBh 68,10 (*yas tu*)	***yang su zhig***	*yongs su zhig*[275]
ASBh 68,27 (*dauḥśīlyasamutthāpakānāṃ*)	***'chal ba'i tshul khrims kun nas slong ba de dag nyid kyi***	*'chal ba'i tshul khrims kyi*[276] *kun nas slong ba de dag nyid kyi*
ASBh 68,28 (*ārupyeṣu*)	***gzugs med pa rnams***	*gzugs med pa rnams*

268 The sDe-dge editor probably brought the two accumulations (*tshogs gnyis*) into play here.

269 sDe-dge here ignores the ablative case, which expresses comparison.

270 sDe-dge wrongly changes ablative into instrumental.

271 Peking accurately renders the Sanskrit compound.

272 The sDe-dge reading is an inaccurate simplification.

273 The Peking reading is both semantically and graphically close to sDe-dge. Still, sDe-dge is more accurate.

274 The sDe-dge editor possibly considered *yid mi bde ba* to be redundant.

275 The sDe-dge reading *yongs su* is a rather insignificant, careless mistake.

276 Peking accurately renders the Sanskrit compound, or the accusative case. The genitive particle added by sDe-dge is not completely wrong.

277 sDe-dge does not render the locative case, and seems to understand *gzugs med pa rnams* as "the beings in the immaterial realm", which appears to be a simplification of the original Tibetan locative case.

	na	*ni*[277]
ASBh 69,4 (*parān*)	*gzhan las*[278]	***gzhan dag la***
ASBh 69,11 (*bahutīvravicitrā*)	***mang zhing mi bzad la sna tshogs pa***	*mang zhing mi bzad pa*[279] *sna tshogs pa*
ASBh 69,24-25 (*vyāmiśraṃ*)	***'dren ma***[280]	*'dres ma*[281]
ASBh 69,25 (*ekaṃ*)	*gcig*	*gcig na*[282]
ASBh 70,4 (*dānāni dadāti*)	*sbyin pa nas*	***sbyin pa rnams sbyin pa nas***
ASBh 70,11 (*karmaṇas*)	***las las***	*las*
ASBh 71,2 (°*vibhāga*°)	***'gyed pa***	*'ged pa*
ASBh 71,12 (*parivarjanena*)	***yongs su spangs pas***	*yongs su spangs nas*
ASBh 71,22 (*parigṛhītatayā*)	***yongs su zin pa yin pa'i phyir***	*yongs su zin pa'i yin pa'i phyir*
ASBh 72,7 (*anucchavika*)	*'byor ba*	***rjes su 'byor ba***
ASBh 72,9 (*pratirūpa*)	*'tshams med pa*[283]	***'tsham pa***
ASBh 72,17 (*svayaṃkṛtakarma*°)	*rang gi las byas pa'i las*	***rang gis byas pa'i las***
ASBh 72,19 (*svayaṃkṛtavipāka*°)	***rang gis byas pa'i rnam par smin pa***	*rang gis byas pa'i las kyi rnam par smin pa*
ASBh 72,26 (*na*)	***ma yin***	*yin*

From among those thirty readings, Peking is more accurate in twenty cases, sDe-dge in ten. Many of the mistakes in sDe-dge appear to be the result of simplification, of the attempt to produce a more readable Tibetan text. The mistakes in Peking, on the

278 The inaccurate Peking reading does not fit smoothly into the Tibetan sentence. NG read *gzhan dag las*.

279 While Peking elegantly uses two different coordinative particles to render the Sanskrit compound, the easy-reading version of sDe-dge uses *sna tshogs pa* almost like a plural particle ("various").

280 Peking actually reads *'dren na*, which I consider an insignificant mistake. For the sake of simplicity, I correct this to *'dren ma* here, following NG, and all versions of AS_t.

281 sDe-dge here uses the more common expression for "mixture", even though also $AS_{t,D}$ reads *'dren ma*.

282 sDe-dge makes the syntax of the sentence more explicit: "If it is one, then ..." There is, nonetheless, no *yadi* or the like in the Sanskrit text.

283 The scribe or carver quite surely had the well-known five deeds with immediate retribution (*mtshams med lnga*) in mind.

other hand, seem arbitrary, such as *rang gi las byas pa'i las* for *svayaṃkṛtakarma*. Many (but not all) of those could well be more archaic, in contrast to a corrected sDe-dge reading, while the sDe-dge miscorrections stem from the sDe-dge editors themselves.

On the Stemma of the AS_t and $ASBh_t$

Historical sources tell us that manuscripts of various traditions were collated to produce the handwritten old sNar thang *bstan 'gyur* in the early fourteenth century.[284] It was copied, taking other MS traditions into account, under Bu ston at Zhwa lu in 1335.[285]

That Zha lu bstan 'gyur was copied, and one copy of it was deposited at Phying ba stag rtse. That version is said to have been the hypearchetype above PNG.[286] D is based on the Zhwa lu MS and four different MS traditions, which is possible, even though I cannot provide any stemmatic evidence, and C in turn is a copy of D (which, again, ?mostly agrees with my findings).

I will now discuss the stemmatic relation of the various versions of the AS_t and $ASBh_t$, comparing my findings to the observations MATHES (*Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, pp. 37-40) made about the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, *Dharmadharmatāvibhāgakārikā* and the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāgavṛtti*.[287]

Archetype of AS_t and $ASBh_t$

The original[288] for all five versions of AS_t must have contained several errors.[289] For example, the reading *thun mong ba ma yin* ($AS_{t,P}$ 102b7; AS 55,12-13: **sulabha*) is found in all versions, against $ASVy_t$ *rnyed par sla ba ma yin* and AS_c 不易可得.[290] Such mistakes probably go back to the original translators and I have not tried to

---

[284] SCHOENING, *Śālistamba Sūtra*, p. 127.

[285] SCHOENING, *Śālistamba Sūtra*, pp. 132-134. On the history of the *bstan 'gyur*, see also WANGCHUK, *Resolve*, p. 379f., and KRAGH, *Action and Result*, pp. 73-75, for an overview of the single editions.

[286] For the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, WANGCHUK (*Resolve*, p. 380) agrees with SCHOENING (*Śālistamba Sūtra*, p. 132) who postulates one hypearchetype above PNG. According to SCHOENING, the Phying-ba sTag-rtse MS (17th. c.) formed the basis for the PNG editions of the *bstan 'gyur* in general.

[287] I hope to find time for a systematic evaluation of the *karman* section in the *Zhonghua dazangjing* edition later, even though I think it is mostly irrelevant for the stemma. Cf. DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 78.

[288] For my usage of the terms "original", "archetype" and "hypearchetype", see MAAS, *Textkritik*, p. 7.

[289] Of course, more than five versions of the *bstan 'gyur* existed. See DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, 89.

[290] Interestingly, also the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāgavṛtti* contains some peculiar readings around the word *thun mong ba*. At line 348, for example, sDe dge correctly reads *thun mong ba* against *thun mong ma* in PNGC, and at line 346, DC correctly read *gzhan gyi ni ma yin te thun mong ma yin*, against GNP *byang chub sems dpa' rnams kyi ma yin*.

improve their work. The other mistakes go back to scribes and editors, and, although those two main categories are not always easy to distinguish, I have corrected the AS$_{t}$ text only in cases which I think to belong to the latter category. That approach has led to my correcting the AS$_{t}$ text against all versions in no more than five instances, three of which involve the same wrong reading in all five versions.[291] As those involve the clearly mistaken readings *pas* for *pa'i* and *bas* for *ba'i*, their stemmatic significance is doubtful; instrumental and genitive are often jumbled by Tibetan scribes and editors, so it is well within the range of statistical probability that several editors made the same mistake this one time.[292] In the other two cases, AS$_{t,PNG}$ reads against AS$_{t,DC}$: Once, the sandhi after final *°s* was wrongly executed by AS$_{t,PNG}$ (*gyi* instead of *kyi*),[293] and in the other case, AS$_{t,PNG}$ wrongly uses the instrumental, while AS$_{t,DC}$ has the right case but different terminology.[294] There is thus weak evidence for scribal and editorial mistakes in the archetype above AS$_{t,PNGDC}$.[295] That evidence might be blurred by later corrections, especially on the part of the skilled sDe dge editors, but for the time being it is almost impossible to distinguish those from original correct readings, jumbled in the PNG branch.[296]

As for the ASBh$_{t}$, I opted to correct against all readings in twenty-three cases, and in every case all five versions were in agreement. The situation is thus quite different from the AS$_{t}$ even if one takes into consideration that I was more courageous in correcting ASBh$_{t}$, having a Sanskrit MS of it at hand, and that the ASBh passage is longer. Of those 23 readings, genitive and instrumental particles are mixed up in five cases, other

---

291 1) As AS 57,19-20: *ba'i*; AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGD}$ *bas*. 1) As AS 57,20-22: *ba'i*; AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGD}$ *ba*. 3) Ad AS 60,21-22: *pa'i*; AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'i*.

292 Such an attempt to improve the text by changing genitive to instrumental or vice versa would in my opinion fall under the group of "casual attempts to improve [...] the text" (HARRISON, *Druma-kinnara-rāja-paripṛccha-sūtra*, p. xxv), which makes it one of the "transmissional" variants which are often of lesser stemmatic value. See also ZIMMERMANN, *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra*, p. 210.

293 Ad AS 57,5-7: *bsnyen gnas kyi*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bsnyen gnas gyi*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *bsnyen gnas pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bsnyen gnas pa'i*.

294 Ad AS 54,5-6: *dbang gi*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *dbang gis*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *bdag po'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bdag po'i*.

295 Cf. MATHES (*Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, p. 37) who has found more evidence for original mistakes in the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāgavṛtti*. It is quite probable that the canonical versions of AS and ASBh go back to those MSS produced under dBus pa blo gsal (see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 82), and possibly each depended on various original MSS (*phyi mo*) available to the editors at that time.

296 One example: Ad AS 55,13-16, AS$_{t,PNG}$ wrongly read *nyes par spyod pa* for **upabhoga*, against AS$_{t,DC}$ *nye bar spyod pa*. Conversely, ŚrBh$_{t,P}$ 199a8 reads *nye bar spyad pa* (=NG) for *duścarita* against DC *nyes par spyad pa* (see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 362). Taking both cases into account, the wrong PNG readings seem arbitrary and not based on a preference to read either *nyes par* or *nye bar*. If one presupposes such a tendency, PNG might have transmitted one original mistake (corrected by D) and added one on its own. As said above, this reasoning is weak evidence.

particles are concerned in eleven cases, two of which are really significant.[297] In five cases the orthography or morphology of a verb is concerned.[298] One complete phrase, mentioning the conceivable (*cintya*) aspects of *karman* (ad ASBh 72,26-27), is left out in all versions; it seems that the editor of a version above PNGDC did not really grasp the distinction between conceivable and inconceivable aspects of *karman*.[299] Apart from that, in the AS$_{t}$, DC correctly read *bsam gyis khyab pa* (*cintya*) in all three occurrences of that word, and while PNG read *bsam gyis mi khyab pa* in all cases I think it possible that the D editors of AS$_{t}$ correctly omitted *mi* based on a comparison with ASVy$_{t}$ or ASBh$_{t}$, and logical inference, but I have no evidence for that. In the only instance where I corrected the spelling of a noun in the ASBh$_{t}$, the mistake is also corrected in the ASVy$_{t}$.[300] An example for strict fidelity of all versions to the original translation is ASBh 66,17 (°*ākārāyāḥ samyagdṛṣṭer*), where ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ reads *rnam pa'i yang dag pa'i lta ba'i*, although a miscorrection to *rnam par yang dag pa'i lta ba* could have easily occurred.

Relations between D and C

In the vast majority of cases where we find variant readings, the group PNG

---

[297] 1) Ad ASBh 62,7: *rang*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rang*. 2) Ad ASBh 73,1: *khyab*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *mi khyab*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *mi khyab pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *khyab pa*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *mi khyab pa*.

[298] Significant are 1) Ad ASBh 72,24: *brten*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bstan*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *brtan*. 2) Ad ASBh 74,1-3: *rtogs*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gtogs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rtogs*. I discuss both emanations in the notes. The chart below shows two examples of verbal nouns that were handled in different ways in the various texts and editions:

bhayadarśī AS 60,5-6	*'jigs par lta ba* AS$_{t,PNGDC}$	*'jig par blta ba* ASVy$_{t,P}$ *'jigs par blta ba* ASVy$_{t,D}$
bhayadarśī ASBh 71,18	*'jigs par lta ba* ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$	*'jigs par lta ba* ASVy$_{t,PD}$

anuprāpti (AS 60,14-15)	*'thob par byed pa* AS$_{t,PNG}$ *thob par byed pa* AS$_{t,DC}$	*'thob par byed pa* ASVy$_{t,PD}$
anuprāpti (ASBh 72,6)	*thob par byed pa* ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$	*'thob par byed pa* ASVy$_{t,PD}$

[299] I do not assume that the editors of the PNG and the DC branches independently omitted the phrase introducing the *cintya* aspects. There are surely "text-internal reasons" (see ZIMMERMANN, *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra*, p. 173) for such an omission but I do not consider them strong enough to suggest independent redactional decisions in the various stemmatic branches.

[300] See my notes ad ASBh 64,26 (*saṃtānapariṇāma*): *rgyud gyur*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rgyur gyur*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rgyun 'gyur*.

reads against DC, which is the common situation for most parts of the *bstan 'gyur*.[301] For the AS, all readings of D against PNG are repeated in C, except for two, one of which is the correction of a D misprint by the Co-ne editors,[302] and the other most probably a scribal error.[303] There are thirteen single variants in C. Interestingly, C contains the archaic reading *gyurd* on one occasion, for which I have no explanation.[304] For the ASBh, there are 56 exceptions to the rule that C reads with D, among which 50 are single variants in C. In six cases, C reads with PNG against D: in one case, the nominalizer *ba* is added, and all of the other five cases concern verbal morphology.[305] Those variations also occur in the single variants of C and they are thus within the degree of liberty or inaccuracy that the C editors allowed themselves. It seems that in those six cases the C editors (more or less consciously) followed the same grammatical principles as the PNG editors.[306] Therefore, I think those six overlappings with PNG do not provide strong enough evidence for a contamination of C with any branch or hypearchetype of the PNG group.[307]

Relations between PG and NCD

From the among the thirteen readings of N against PG in the AS, there are only two instances where NDC reads against PG.[308] Both are of within the range of divergence that also the single variants of N have, and would at first sight not provide any

---

301 See MATHES, *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, p. 38. WANGCHUK (*Resolve*, p. 380) calls C a "faithful copy" of D.

302 Ad AS 53,8-10: AS$_{t,PNGC}$ *log*; AS$_{t,D}$ *leg*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *log*.

303 Ad AS 60,9-11: AS$_{t,D}$ *'dzin gyi bar*; AS$_{t,C}$ *'dzin gyi rang*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *'dzin*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,ND}$ *'dzin gyi bar*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *'dzin* (letter erased) *gyi bar*. The incorrect reading of AS$_{t,PNG}$ seems to go back to an *ad hoc* deletion on the part of an editor.

304 AS 57,16-18: AS$_{t,PNGD}$ *gyur*; AS$_{t,C}$ *gyurd*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gyur*.

305 1) ad ASBh 64,8-10: ASBh$_{t,PNGC}$ *skur ba 'debs par*; ASBh$_{t,D}$ *skur 'debs par*. 2) ad ASBh 68,9-12: ASBh$_{t,PNGC}$ *myong*; ASBh$_{t,D}$ *myang*. 3) ad ASBh 68,27-28: ASBh$_{t,D}$ *gzhag*; ASBh$_{t,PNGC}$ *bzhag*. 4) ad ASBh 72,13-15: ASBh$_{t,PNGC}$ *bcags*; ASBh$_{t,D}$ *gcags*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bcags*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gcags*. 5) ad ASBh 73,17-18: ASBh$_{t,PNGC}$ *myong*; ASBh$_{t,D}$ *myang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *myong*. 6) ad ASBh 74,1-3: ASBh$_{t,D}$ *sgrub*; ASBh$_{t,PNGC}$ *bsgrub*.

306 Therefore, C is helpful to evaluate PNG against D, and that is why I chose to consider the C readings, transgressing the rule *eliminatio codicum descriptorum* taught at MAAS, *Textkritik*, p. 5. Cf. KRAGH, *Action and Result*, p. 75.

307 In the case of the Yogācāra texts he examined , MATHES' (*Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, p. 38) thinks it possible, but by no means established, that C is either contaminated with GNP, or that C derives from an hypearchtype above CD. As far as I understand DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 87), he sees no text-internal indications for a contamination of C in the case of the ŚrBh. A different situation seems to exist in the *stotra* section of the *bstan 'gyur*, where C often reads with P against D. See SCHNEIDER, *Lobpreis*, p. 44. According to DELEANU (*ibid.*) that applies to some extent also to the *Sūtrasamuccaya*.

308 1) ad AS 59,17-19: AS$_{t,NDC}$ *par*; AS$_{t,PG}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *par*. 2) AS$_{t,NDC}$ *ltar*; AS$_{t,PG}$ *lta*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ltar*.

evidence for an hypearchetype above the group PG. Still, when considering that out of the thirteen cases where N reads against PG, six are formed by the N reading *bsod* (against *gsod* in PGDC), the ratio of two NDC readings is surprisingly high.[309] This would agree with the findings of MATHES (*Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, p. 39), who postulates an hypearchetype above PG.[310] In the ASBh, there are only two, insignificant, PG-NDC readings among the twenty-six cases where N reads against PG, and twenty-four instances of PGDC-N.[311]

Relations between NG and PDC

In the AS, there are three cases where NGDC read against P and none where PDC read against NG. The ASBh contains seven cases where NGDC read against P and one where NGD read against P (C there contains an odd mistake at that point).[312] In contrast to that, there is only one instance where PDC read against NG. The ASBh text in NG here wrongly contains a double negation. I assume that that double negation is the original reading which is preserved in NG, while it has been corrected by the P and the D editors independently.[313] This observation, that the PDC readings against NG do not indicate an hypearchetype above PDC, conforms to MATHES, *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, p. 39.

Relations between PN and GDC

Among the six instances where PN reads against G in the AS, five show the constellation PNDC against G, and only in one case PN against G which in turn reads against DC.[314] In the latter case, G has misunderstood the ablative particle *las* to mean *karman* ("their *karman* [has been] born", *de dag gi las skyes pa*, [sic]), while DC contain a semantically correct clarification ("being born from those castes", *de dag gi rigs las skyes pa*). The original reading is, I think, preserved in PN ("being born from those", *de dag las skyes pa*).

In the ASBh, there are sixteen instances of PNDC against G, and only three where GDC read against PN. All three can be explained as independent corrections (or,

---

[309] The reoccurring, but not consistent misspelling of *gsod nams* for *bsod nams* ($AS_{t,N}$ 93a-b) may be due to the facts that a.) *ba* and *ga* are optically similar, and b.) the word *gsod* is more common than *bsod*.

[310] As far as I understand DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 79), it seems that the readings PG against N when compared to the readings NG against P do not suggest an hypearchetype above PG in the case of the ŚrBh.

[311] I think this strongly supports DELEANU 's thesis that G should be taken into consideration in the critical edition of a *bstan 'gyur* text (id., *Mundane Path*, p. 79f., and p. 97, n. 56).

[312] Ad ASBh 73,7-9: $ASBh_{t,NGD}$ *ni*; $ASBh_{t,C}$ *nyid*; $ASBh_{t,P}$ *na*.

[313] Ad ASBh 69,21-22: $ASBh_{t,PDC}$ *pa mi 'dod pa*; $ASBh_{t,NG}$ *pa mi 'dod pa ma*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[314] Ad AS 58,3-7: $AS_{t,PN}$ *de dag las skyes pa*; $AS_{t,G}$ *de dag gi las skyes pa*; $AS_{t,DC}$ *de dag gi rigs las skyes pa*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *de dag gi las skyes pa*.

miscorrections) of the G and the DC editors.[315] This, too, agrees with MATHES (*Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, p. 39), who found the PN-GDC variants to originate from causes other than stemmatic dependence.[316]

The Text of the *Abhidharmasamuccayavyākhyā*

The ASVy *Abhidharmasamuccayavyākhyā* is preserved in Tibetan (D 4054, P 5555, N 3546) and Chinese (T 1606, trans. XUANZANG). It seems to consists mostly of the text of the AS merged with that of the ASBh, with some minor additions and only occasional longer explanations (for example, in the *karman* section, the text of the additional leaf). Of the Sanskrit text, only the additional leaf (contained in $ASBh_T$ 65,7-66,4) and some margin notations are preserved (apart from the AS and ASBh MSS).[317] The additional leaf will be presented along with the Tibetan and Chinese translations of the AKBh for the sake of comparison. On the photographs from Patna the front side of the additional leaf has been photographed among the B sides (plate II 15), and the back side among the A sides (plate II 14).

How are the AS and the ASBh "Mixed" in the ASVy?

The compilator of the ASVy freely employed various approaches in combining the AS text with that of the ASVy. Most commonly, an introductory sentence of the AS (e.g. "There are also five kinds of *karman*:") is followed by the AS list of terms ("*Karman* that is perception, *karman* that is ..."), after which the ASBh explanations of those terms are added ("*Karman* that is perception consists in ..."). In cases where the ASBh adds some explanations to single sentences in the AS, the ASVy as a rule contains the AS sentence, followed the ASBh explanation, but when the inclusion of the complete AS and ASBh sentences would result in unnecessary repetitions, parts of either the AS or ASBh text are often left out in the ASVy. Normally, the Tibetan and Chinese translations agree. Some exceptions to those rules can be seen in the charts below.

• In the ASVy, the AS passage need not necessarily precede the ASBh explanations. Occasionally the AS passage may be embedded in or placed after $ASBh_t$ text, as in the following example (ad AS 61,3-4):

AS_t	**ji ltar na las kyi skye gnas pa yin zhe na / rgyu med pa dang mi mthun pa'i rgyu rnam par spangs pa'i las kyi skye gnas las sems can byung ba'i phyir ro //**
$ASBh_t$	rang gis byas pa'i las la 'dod pa dang mi 'dod pa dag gi rnam par smin pa myong ba'i sems can de dag thog ma ga las byung / ci rgyu med pa las byung ba zhig

---

[315] Ad ASBh 63,14-15: $ASBh_{t,GDC}$ *sems can gyi*; $ASBh_{t,PN}$ *sems gyi*. Ad ASBh 63,14-15: $ASBh_{t,PN}$ *pa*; $ASBh_{t,GDC}$ *pa'i de*. Ad ASBh 70,20: $ASBh_{t,GDC}$ *rtsa ba*; $ASBh_{t,PN}$ *rtsa*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *rtsa ba*.

[316] Also WANGCHUK (*Resolve*, p. 381) has noticed that G is rich in errors and liberal corrections.

[317] According to EJIMA, *Dhātunirdeśa*, p. vii f., also the AKBh MS contains margin notations, some of which go back to the original scribe, and other to later students. For reasons of time I could not verify that on the MS. I assume that especially those scholars working on a translation project into Tibetan would tend to note down corrections to the text.

	gam / 'on te rang bzhin dang dbang phyug la sogs pa'i rgyu las byung ba zhig ce na / smras pa / las kyi skye gnas pa dag go // 'di dag gi las nyid rgyu med pa dang mi mthun pa'i rgyu rnam par spangs pa'i skye gnas te / sems can rnams 'byung ba'i phyir zhes bya ba'i tha tshig go //
ASVy$_t$	rang gis byas pa'i las 'dod pa dang / mi 'dod pa dag gis rnam par smin pa myong ba'i sems can de dag thog ma gang las byung / ci rgyu med pa las byung ba zhig gam /'on te rang bzhin dang dbang phyug la sogs pa'i rgyu las byung ba zhig ce na / smras pa / las kyi skye gnas las 'gyur ro // **ji ltar na las kyi skye gnas pa yin / rgyu med pa dang / mi mthun pa'i rgyu rnam par spangs pa'i las kyi skye gnas las sems can 'byung ba'i phyir ro** // 'di dag gi las nyid rgyu med pa dang mi mthun pa'i rgyu rnam par spangs pa'i skye gnas te / sems can rnams 'byung ba'i phyir zhes bya ba'i tha tshig go //
AS$_c$	**云何從業所生。是諸有情遠離無因惡因。唯從業所生故。**
ASVy$_c$	問是諸有情受自作業愛不愛異熟時。初從何生。爲無因耶。爲因世性自在等耶。答從業所生。**云何從業所生。是諸有情遠離無因惡因。唯從業所生故。**謂諸有情遠離無因惡因。唯由業等因緣所生。

• In some cases, ASVy$_c$ and ASVy$_t$ differ,[318] and while I could not ascertain whether the Chinese or the Tibetan editors took the liberty to change the text, I assume that redundancy should be considered the *lectio difficilior* and thus probably the original reading. In this example (ad AS 60,2-3, variant readings ignored), only ASVy$_t$ omits the redundant phrase, while it is contained in ASVy$_c$. The ASVy$_t$ simplification probably goes back to Nyi ma rgyal mtshan's revision.

AS$_t$	ji ltar na tshul khrims dang ldan pa yin zhe na / yang dag par blangs pa'i tshul khrims rjes su bsrung ba'i phyir ro //
ASBh$_t$	*tshul khrims yang dag par blangs nas ma nyams pas de dang ldan pa'i phyir tshul khrims dang ldan pa yin no //*
ASVy$_t$	ji ltar na tshul khrims dang ldan pa yin / yang dag par blangs pa'i tshul khrims rjes su bsrung ba'i phyir ro // *ma nyams pas de dang ldan pa'i phyir tshul khrims dang ldan pa yin no //*
AS$_c$	云何成就尸羅。能受能護淨尸羅故。
ASVy$_c$	云何成就尸羅。能受能護淨尸羅故。*謂受持淨戒相應無缺。故名成就尸羅。*

• The chart below (ad AS 56,3-5) shows a passage where the ASVy$_t$ contains both the AS and the ASBh text, while it is condensed in the ASVy$_c$.

AS$_t$	yang 'dod pa dang rab tu ldan pa'i mi dge ba gang yin pa dang
ASBh$_t$	*'dod pa dang rab tu ldan pa'i mi dge ba ni rang bzhin gyis stobs dang ldan pa*

[318] See also, e.g., ad AS 56,8, and ad AS 56,14-57,2.

	ste
$ASVy_t$	yang 'dod pa dang rab tu ldan pa'i mi dge ba gang yin pa dang[319] / *'dod pa dang rab tu ldan pa'i mi dge ba ni rang bzhin gyis stobs dang ldan pa ste*
AS_c	又欲界繫諸不善業性皆是強力
$ASVy_c$	又欲界繫諸不善業性皆是強

On the Tibetan Translation and Transmission of the ASVy

According to the colophon, the Tibetan translation of the ASVy was done by Jinamitra and Ye shes sde.[320] It was revised "in accordance with the Sanskrit text" (*rgya dpe dang mthun par*) by Nyi ma rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po. I would like to look at this process in more detail and add some reflections on the early translation, the transmission lineage, and on Nyi ma rgyal mtshan's revision.

The Early Translators of the ASVy

To evaluate the $ASVy_t$ colophon concerning the early translation, a comparison with the AS_t and $ASBh_t$ presents the following picture:

AS_t	translated by Jinamitra, Śīlendrabodhi, Ye shes sde[321]
$ASBh_t$	translated by Jinamitra, Śīlendrabodhi, Ye shes sde
$ASVy_t$	translated by Jinamitra, Ye shes sde; revised by Nyi ma rgyal mtshan[322]

Presupposing hypothetically that the colophons are correct, the following historical development would be most probable: After the initial translation of AS and ASBh, the remaining task just consisted in arranging the already finished translations and making minor amendments. The cooperation of two Indian scholars was no longer necessary, so Śīlendrabodhi did not participate.

It is, nonetheless, clear by now that translator's colophons, especially of the early

---

[319] Note that the conjunction *dang* does not fit into the syntax of the $ASVy_t$ sentence.

[320] See $ASVy_{t,P}$ 361b8-362a8.

[321] Closely related texts, the translations of the *Mahāyānasaṃgraha* and its commentary by *Asvabhāva, are ascribed to the same three persons. LAMOTTE, *Somme*, vol. 1, p. v.

[322] TARTHANG TULKU ("History of the Buddhist Dharma", p. 155f.) writes that "Jinamitra and Śīlendrabodhi (both of whom were direct disciples of Pūrṇavardhana, who was a disciple of Sthiramati), together with Ye-shes-sde, translated and wrote a commentary on the *Abhidharma-samuccaya* [...], called the *Kun las btus pa'i bshad pa*. By collating this commentary with the *Kun las btus pa*, Nyi-ma-rgyal-mtshan dPal-bzang po created a work called the *Kun las btus pa'i btus pa bshad pa* [sic] which was translated by Jinamitra, Śīlendrabodhi, and Ye-shes-sde." This interpretation of the sources is rather coarse, and it is not clear whether the arrangement of the $ASVy_t$ is actually ascribed to NYI MA RGYAL MTSHAN, or whether JINAMITRA is identified with RGYAL BA'I SRAS.

translations, can be spurious.[323] If, thus, the colophons are later additions, that same scenario was possibly imagined by the person who wrote them, constructing a myth of origin only loosely related to transmitted legends of texts and scholars.

Possibly older than many of the *bstan-'gyur* colophons are the catalogues prepared under the ancient Tibetan kings. In those, the next irritating fact about the ASVy$_{t}$ is to be found, namely that the Lhan-dkar-ma catalogue mentions *only one* commentary to the AS. In the said catalogue (see LALOU, "Les textes Bouddhiques", p. 334), the AS (*chos mngon pa kun las btus pa*, no. 630) is listed along with an unspecified commentary to it (*de'i 'grel pa*, no. 631). The AS is said to consist of six bundles (*bam po*), i.e. 1800 *ślokas*, while the commentary has eleven bundles (3300 *ślokas*). In the Peking edition, by comparison, the AS$_{t,P}$ consists of five bundles, the ASBh$_{t,P}$ of ten (bundles are not counted in the ASVy$_{t}$). As for the number of folios in the Peking edition, the AS$_{t,P}$ has 91, the ASBh$_{t,P}$ 143, and the ASVy$_{t,P}$ 220 folios. That means that the commentary mentioned in the Lhan-dkar-ma catalogue (no. 631) was most likely the ASBh$_{t}$, being less than double the size of the AS$_{t}$. That calculation agrees with the information in the 'Phang-thang-ma catalogue, which explicitly mentions the AS$_{t}$ "root text" (*Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i rtsa ba*, no. 559, six bundles) and the ASBh$_{t}$ (*Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i bshad pa*, no. 560, eleven bundles).[324] Therefore, the ASVy$_{t}$ was quite surely unknown at that time!

In his history of Buddhism, Bu ston speaks about the translators of the AS and related texts: "The summary (*sdom*) of the common vehicle,[325] the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* [consists of] five bundles. Although is said to [consist of] six bundles, it exists in five.[326] [Also] its commentary written by the master rGyal po'i sras[327]

[323] See DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 91, n. 1 and also ZIMMERMANN, *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra*, pp. 211-213, for an examination of the Tibetan colophons of the *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra* which shows them to be rather unreliable. Cf. LAMOTTE, *Somme*, vol. 1, p. v, and GRIFFITHS, et al., *Realm of Awakening*, p. xv, who render the data from the MSg$_{t}$ colophons without questioning them.

[324] KAWAGOE, *'Phang thang ma*, pp. 28, 52.

[325] On the "common vehicle", see also LAMOTTE, *Histoire*, p. 697.

[326] The AS is listed in the Lhan-dkar-ma catalogue as a work of six bundles. It is not clear, whether it is the Lhan-dkar-ma catalogue that BU STON refers to when he states that the AS is "said to [consist of] six bundles". At any rate, the Peking edition matches BU STON's information in counting five bundles. In the beginning of RGYAL TSHAB's commentary (AS-rGyal-tshab) we find the information that the AS consists of five bundles which comprise 300 *ślokas* each (*sho lo ka sum brgya la bam bor byas pa'i lnga yod pa'i bam po dang po zhes pa'o*, AS-rGyal-tshab, pp. 462,6-463,1). That makes 1500 *ślokas* in total, or 46500 syllables if we assume that a *śloka* has roughly 31 syllables (ZIMMERMANN, *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra*, p. 210, n. 95). Still, according to STEINKELLNER, "Paralokasiddhi-Texts", p. 222, n. 8, the length of a so-called *śloka* may vary considerably in the Tibetan canon.

[327] Tib. rGyal po'i sras seems to stand for Skt. Rājaputra, which normally refers to the AKBh commentator Yaśomitra (Tib. Grags pa bshes gnyen). See GOKHALE, "Fragments", p. 13 ("Rājaputra Yaśomitra?"), and TATIA, *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣyam*, p. xxi. The ascription of

in eleven bundles[328] [and] the *Chos mngon pa la 'jug pa'i rgya cher 'grel pa'i snying po kun las btus pa*[329] in six bundles and fifty *ślokas* were[330] translated by Ye shes sde. The commentary on the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* by the master Asaṅga[331] was translated by Grags pa rgyal mtshan and Nyi ma rgyal mtshan." [332] If my interpretation of this passage is correct, it leads to the following scheme:

AS	translated by Ye shes sde
ASBh	translated by Ye shes sde
ASVy	translated by Grags pa rgyal mtshan and Nyi ma rgyal mtshan

By comparison with the colophons, Bu ston's scheme is in agreement only in so far as Ye shes sde appears as the translator of the AS and ASBh. That in turn corresponds to the situation we find, for example, in the *Tathāgathagarbhasūtra* colophons: While different versions mention different translators (with the Phug-brag versions having no colophon at all), all colophons agree in only one name, that of Ye shes sde.[333]

Even though the colophons to the early translations should thus be viewed upon with some reservations, the revisor's colophon found in the end of the ASVy certainly carries a higher degree of authenticity, even more so as it is partly supported by the writings of the revisor's direct disciple, Bu ston.

The Later "Revisors"

I think Bu ston is quite credible when he states that Grags pa rgyal mtshan had a hand in the processing of the $ASVy_t$, even though he is not mentioned in the colophon. The name of this translator (*grags pa rgyal mtshan*, "Victory Banner of Fame") was extremely

the ASBh to "rGyal po'i sras" frequently occurs in more recent sources, for example in the colophon of AS-gZhan-dga, fol. 206a1.

328 The AS commentary mentioned in the Lhan-dkar-ma catalogue allegedly consisted of eleven bundles. BU STON most probably refers to the ASBh here.

329 That commentary to the *Abhidharmāvatāra* (P 5598, D 4097) is contained in the *mngon pa* section of P. Its translation is ascribed to Jinamitra, Dānaśīla and Ye shes sde in the colophon (P *thu* 391a2).

330 I understand Tib. *rnams* here to the effect that more than two texts must be meant, which then implies that also the AS was translated by YE SHES SDE.

331 Even though the syntax of the Tibetan sentence clearly points to Asaṅga as the author of the commentary, it is quite sure that BU STON here means the ASVy.

332 BU STON, "Chos kyi 'byung gnas", fol. 162a1-3: *theg pa thun mong gi sdom mngon pa kun las btus pa bam po lnga / 'di bam po drug ces 'byung yang lngar gnas so // de'i 'grel pa slob dpon rgyal po'i sras kyis mdzad pa bam po bcu gcig pa / chos mngon pa la 'jug pa'i rgya cher 'grel pa'i snying po kun las btus pa bam po drug dang shu log lnga bcu pa rnams ye shes sde'i 'gyur / mngon pa kun las btus kyi 'grel pa slob dpon thogs med kyis mdzad pa grags pa rgyal mtshan dang nyi ma rgyal mtshan gyi 'gyur /*. See also HAKAMAYA, *Yuishikishisō*, p. 353, n. 16. On both translators, see below.

333 See ZIMMERMANN, *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra*, pp. 211-213.

popular in his period, and the biographies of some Grags pa rgyal mtshan's seem to have merged. In this case here, Bu ston quite surely refers to Yar klungs lo tsā ba Grags pa rgyal mtshan (late 13th to early 14th c.),[334] whom he also mentions in his history of Buddhism in Tibet right before his account on Nyi ma rgyal mtshan.[335] If his dates as 1242-1346 are correct, Yar lo lived for 105 years.[336] He was active, among other places, in the capital of Mang yul gung thang.[337]

Already DE JONG ("Colophons", p. 531) has mentioned the difficulties in identifying the correct Grags pa rgyal mtshan among the many persons of that name.[338] Yar klungs lo tsā ba Grags pa rgyal mtshan is not to be confused with Bu ston's main sponsor, the Zhwa-lu-pa prince sKu zhang Grags pa rgyal mtshan (b. 13th c., TBRC-P3679) or with Lo chen Grags pa rgyal mtshan (1352-1405), who was a grandnephew of dPang Lo tsā ba Blo gros brtan pa and his immediate successor as the abbot of Bo-dong-E monastery.[339] Similar to Yar lo, Lo chen Grags pa rgyal mtshan was

---

[334] TBRC-P2637, dates according to VERHAGEN, *Transmission*, pp. 93, 349 and VERHAGEN, *Assimilation*, p. 211: c. 1285/1295 until after 1378; Dates according to the TBRC online catalogue: 1242-1346). YAR KLUNGS LO TSĀ BA is explicitly mentioned in ROERICH, *Blue Annals: Part I*, p. 350 and *Part II*, p. 838.

[335] BU STON, *Chos kyi 'byung gnas*, fol. 140b2, "*yar lung ba grags pa rgyal mtshan*". Other versions read "*yar lungs pa*", see SZERB, *Bu ston's History*, p. 106.

[336] That extraordinary life-span is pointed out by MARTIN (*Tibskrit*, s.v. Yar lung Grags pa rgyal mtshan, 1242-1346). The source for those dates is unknown to me, but they are found in DUNG DKAR (*Bod rig pa'i tshig mdzod chen mo*, pp. 2287-2298): 1242-1346 (there is a misprint on p. 2287 stating that he died in 1242).

[337] See the colophon to D 4315, quoted in MARTIN, *Tibskrit*, s.v. Sambuddhabhāṣita-pratibimbalakṣaṇavivaraṇa.

[338] The same problem reappears, e.g., in VERHAGEN, *Assimilation*, p. 52f.

[339] He is also counted as DPANG LO's intermediate successor as the abbot of Shel dkar chos sde, although LO CHEN GRAGS PA RGYAL MTSHAN actually founded the monastery. On LO CHEN GRAGS PA RGYAL MTSHAN, see DIEMBERGER, et al., *Feast of Miracles*, p. 24f., NGAG DBANG SKAL LDAN RGYA MTSHO, *History of the "White Crystal"*, pp. 49-51 and 72-76, 'DAR STOD DGRA 'DUL BANG PO, "Rig gnas lnga ji ltar byung ba'i tshul", p. 306f., and 'GOS LO TSĀ BA, *Blue Annals*, vol. *tha*, fol. 16b (ROERICH, *Blue Annals: Part II*, p. 788). ▪ YAR KLUNGS LO TSĀ BA GRAGS PA RGYAL MTSHAN is identified with LO CHEN GRAGS PA RGYAL MTSHAN in KO ZHUL GRAGS PA 'BYUNG GNAS and RGYAL BA BLO BZANG MKHAS GRUB, *Ming mdzod*, p. 1561, and VERHAGEN, *Assimilation*, p. 412. This is inaccurate, as LO CHEN GRAGS PA RGYAL MTSHAN was born long after BU STON (b. 1290), and he was not from Yar klungs (or, Yar lung). His home was in Phyag chung below bCad phu sengge gling in La stod Zur tsho. See NGAG DBANG SKAL LDAN RGYA MTSHO, *History of the "White Crystal"*, fol. 41b2. For a map of Zur tsho, see *ibid.*, p. 158; For a map of Yar klungs, see TSERING GYALBO, HAZOD, and SØRENSEN, *Civilization at the Foot of Mount Sham-po*, p. 241 and FERRARI, *Central Tibet*, map C. ▪ MARTIN (*Tibskrit*, s.v. Yar lung Grags pa rgyal mtshan, 1242-1346) doubts that YAR LO is identical with SHUD KE LO TSĀ BA GRAGS PA RGYAL MTSHAN (see also DE JONG, "Colophons", p. 518). ▪ Other GRAGS PA RGYAL MTSHAN's of that period include DOL PO PA's teachers, KUN SPANGS GRAGS PA RGYAL MTSHAN (1262-1323, TRBC-P3281, see also STEARNS, *The Buddha from Dolpo*, p. 14), who taught *abhidharma* to DOL PO PA, and

active in Gung thang. He worked there under king bSod nams lde (1371-1404) who also invited Red mda' ba.[340]

The author of the "revisor's" colophon, Thar pa Lo tsā ba Nyi ma rgyal mtshan", was a teacher of Bu ston.[341] Bu ston describes his studies under Nyi ma rgyal mtshan in some detail,[342] and we find that his teacher for the AS was not Nyi ma rgyal mtshan but bSod nams mgon po. Both are counted among Bu ston's six most important teachers.[343] Thar pa Lo tsā was close to both Yar lo and dPang lo in so far as the three had partly studied under the same teacher.[344] Bu ston, in his history of Buddhism, further relates that Nyi ma rgyal mtshan had studied in Nepal for fourteen years, acquired Sanskrit manuscripts, and also invited a paṇḍita (probably from Nepal) for translation projects.[345]

SKYI STON GRAGS PA RGYAL MTSHAN (b. 13th c., TBRC-P144, see also STEARNS, *The Buddha from Dolpo*, pp. 12-14, 16). SKYI STON was a disciple of DPANG LO (see MANG THOS KLU SGRUB RGYA MTSHO, "bsTan brtsis gsal ba'i nyin byed", p. 173). ▪ See also the various GRAGS PA RGYAL MTSHANs listed in PETECH, *Central Tibet*, p. 158.

340 See NGAG DBANG SKAL LDAN RGYA MTSHO, *History of the "White Crystal"*, p. 73.

341 On NYI MA RGYAL MTSHAN DPAL BZANG PO (late 13th to early 14th c., TBRC-P2147), see VERHAGEN, *Transmission*, p. 94, and VERHAGEN, *Assimilation*, p. 408. Although NYI MA RGYAL MTSHAN is mentioned as the teacher of BU STON in 'DAR STOD DGRA 'DUL BANG PO, "Rig gnas lnga ji ltar byung ba'i tshul", p. 303, there is no biography of him there. That reference in VERHAGEN, *Assimilation*, p. 412, seems to be inaccurate. A detailed biography of NYI MA RGYAL MTSHAN has appeared in DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG, ed. *dKar chag*, vol. 2, pp. 59-62, to which I gained access only shortly in the final stages of this publication, wherefore I cannot discuss it here.

342 BU STON, "rJes su bzung ba'i tshul", pp. 66,3-67,5.

343 See RUEGG, *Life of Bu ston*, p.70, BU STON RIN CHEN GRUB, "rJes su bzung ba'i tshul", p. 37,1-38,2, and BLO GSAL BSTAN SKYONG, *Zhwa lu gdan rabs*, pp. 18,5-6 and 20,4-6.

344 ROERICH, *Blue Annals: Part 2*, p. 792 (Book 10, fol. 18a): "[Shes rab seng ge] was the teacher of the translators Yar, Thar, and dPang."

345 BU STON, "Chos kyi 'byung gnas", fol. 140b2-3: *bdag gi bla ma nyi ma rgyal mtshan dpal bzang pos bal por lo bcu bzhir sbyangs pa mdzad / ri'i kun dga'i mdo la sogs mdo bcu gsum tsam paṇḍ i ta ā [read: a] nanta shrī spyan drangs te bsgyur ro // gzhan yang gzhi 'gyur dang 'gyur bcos mang po mdzad do //*. ROERICH's information that NYI MA RGYAL MTSHAN had also found Sanskrit MSS at bSam yas is, anyhow, based on an ambiguous statement in BU STON's history. ROERICH, *Blue Annals: Part I*, p. 102, n. 1: "My Teacher, the lo-tsā-ba Ñi-ma rgyal-mtshan and Rig-ral, as well as others, maintained that [the rNying ma tantras] were real Tantras, because they had found the Indian original texts at bSam-yas and had discovered parts of the Vajrakīla Tantra in Nepāl." My understanding of the respective passage (BU STON, "Chos kyi 'byung gnas", fol. 179b3) differs slightly: "My teacher, the translator (lit. 'the one who speaks two languages', *skad gnyis smra ba*) Nyi ma'i rgyal mtshan, [bCom ldan] Rig ral, and others say: Because the Indian books [of the ancient tantras] have been found in (or, 'acquired from') bSam yas, and because also Indian books [consisting of] fragments from the Phur-ba Root [Tantra] have appeared in Nepal, [the ancient tantras] are authentic (lit. "pure") tantras." (*kho bo'i bla ma skad gnyis smra ba nyi ma'i rgyal mtshan can dang rigs ral la sogs pa / bsam yas nas rgya dpe rnyed pa'i phyir dang / phur pa rtsa ba'i dum bu'i rgya dpe bal por yang snang bas rgyud yang dag go zhes gsung ngo /*). Already HAKAMAYA (*Yuishikishisō*, p. 353, n. 16) questioned the information he retrieved from

A recent source further claims that Nyi ma rgyal mtshan brought the Sanskrit manuscripts to his home monastery Thar pa gling,[346] where he prepared many of his translations.[347] Thar pa gling was not far from Bu ston's seat Zhwa lu. It is therefore not impossible that some manuscripts photographed in Zhwa lu in the 1930s originally stem from Nyi ma rgyal mtshan's collection. That same source also mentions a travel to India,[348] but as long as no ancient source for that information is known, it has to remain in question.[349]

Nyi ma rgyal mtshan's "Revision"

From the information presented above, it seems possible that Nyi ma rgyal mtshan got hold of an ASVy MS and then, together with Grags pa rgyal mtshan, collated the available texts of the AS_t and $ASBh_t$ to form the $ASVy_t$.[350] I will present some features of the "revised" $ASVy_t$ in a separate section, below.

There are also indications that the $ASVy_t$ became the most popular text for study while the AS_t and $ASBh_t$ were rather neglected. The available versions of both latter texts contain corrupt passages that could have easily been corrected based on the $ASVy_t$ (without transgressing the scope of an editor's responsibility). If the AS_t and $ASBh_t$ had still been in use, the obvious mistakes were more likely to be brought to the editor's attention, even after the first prints had appeared. [351] That, nonetheless, did not happen (luckily, I can say from the point of view of philologist investigating textual history). The commentarian bSod nams grags pa, for example, obviously relied heavily on the $ASVy_t$ and not the $ASBh_t$: In at least one instance he refers to an explanation which originally

---

ROERICH's footnote ("I am not informed whether that is accurate", 確かなこと筆者未詳). Having made those reservations, HAKAMAYA (*ibid.*) speaks of NYI MA RGYAL MTSHAN's Sanskrit MS as "a newly acquired original text" (新たに得た原本).

346 KO ZHUL GRAGS PA 'BYUNG GNAS and RGYAL BA BLO BZANG MKHAS GRUB, *Ming mdzod*, p. 790: *de nas bal yul dang rgya gar sogs su phebs te paṇ grub mang po'i zhabs la gtugs shing rgya gzhung dang legs sbyar gyi skad la phul tu phyin pa sbyangs nas bstan bcos mang po zhig thar ba gling du bzhugs [read: zhugs] shing bod yig tu bsgyur bod yig tu bsgyur ba mdzad //*).

347 See LALOU, *Répertoire du Tanjur*, p. 227 and VERHAGEN, *Transmission*, p. 99.

348 See note above.

349 Cf. VERHAGEN (*Assimilation*, p. 94) who does not speak of any journey to India.

350 LALOU, *Répertoire du Tanjur*, p. 185, lists the ASVy as a translation by NYI MA RGYAL MTSHAN. See also Verhagen, *Assimilation*, p. 85, n. 184, and LALOU, *ibid.*, p. 145. LALOU's catalogue seems to be based on the *bstan-'gyur* colophons exclusively. In their biography of Nyi ma rgyal mtshan, KO ZHUL GRAGS PA 'BYUNG GNAS and RGYAL BA BLO BZANG MKHAS GRUB (*Ming mdzod*, p. 790f.) list some of his translations, but not the ASVy.

351 See, e.g., the distinction between conceivable (*cintya*, *bsam gyis khyab pa*) and inconceivable (*acintya*, *bsam gyis mi khyab pa*) aspects of the *karman* doctrine (AS 61,8-10). Here, both $AS_{t,P}$ and $ASBh_{t,P}$ miss the point in so far as *bsam gyis khyab pa* is either omitted or changed to *bsam gyis mi khyab pa*. Whether the mistakes in $AS_{t,P}$ and $ASBh_{t,P}$ go back to the original translators or rather to later editors, they have not been corrected in either text, although $ASVy_{t,P}$ contains the correct readings.

stems from the ASBh by the words *rnam bshad du* ("in the *vyākhyā*").[352]

On the other hand, I have the impression that the quotations in sGam po pa's *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan* and mChims 'Jam pa'i dbyangs's *mNgon pa'i rgyan* are based on the AS_t and $ASBh_t$. Bu ston, at least in one instance, reproduces the $ASBh_t$ reading (*ltung ba mi byed*, AS-Bu-ston, p. 559,2) and not that of the $ASVy_t$ (*ltung bas mi gnod*). Unfortunately, I have to postpone further research on this issue.[353]

Traditional Genealogies of the Teaching Transmission

I would like to interpret the Tibetan historiographical sources analysed by Dan MARTIN to support the point that the $ASVy_t$ was commonly used for study in Tibet. Even though it is possible to follow my elaborations below without further reference material, it might be helpful to have the chart at pp. 352-357 of Dan MARTIN's article "Tibetan Teaching Transmission of the *Mngon pa kun btus*" at hand when I refer to the various lineage accounts (which MARTIN has listen in columns).

Three Tibetan lineage records (columns A, B, G) claim that the transmission of the AS went through Jinamitra, then Śīlendrabodhi, then Ka ba dPal brtsegs, Cog ro Klu'i rgyal mtshan, Ye shes sde. The other records (columns C, D, F, H, I) [354] list Jinamitra, no Śīlendrabodhi, and then the three Tibetans.

As for the **first three the three Tibetan lineage holders** (Ka ba dPal brtsegs, Cog ro Klu'i rgyal mtshan, Ye shes sde), one source[355] seems to put them in succession, while it seems that all other sources (with the exception of column A, which is ambivalent) considers those three to be one single step (**rim pa*) in the transmission lineage. The arrangement of column I makes sense in so far as a transmission lineage should go through only one person at a time, but it is surely not historically correct. In fact, it can not be ruled out that this kind of artificial linearization happened at other stages, too. Most notably Jinamitra and Śīlendrabodhi, both considered disciples of Pūrṇavardhana (although with major reservations) by Bu ston,[356] appear in linear succession.

As far as I see, the Tibetan accounts do not distinguish "teaching traditions" for the AS, from any **transmission lineage of the ASBh or the ASVy**. One could therefore

---

[352] AS-bSod-grags, fol. 39b4, ad ASBh 70,3-6. According to MaVyu 1453, Tib. *rnam par bshad pa* is the correct equivalent for Skt. *vyākhyā*. Factually, *rnam par bshad pa* (see NEGI, *Tibetan-Sanskrit*, s.v.) sometimes stands for Skt. *bhāṣyam*, but in the case of bSod nams grags pa, it is more probable that he knew the difference between ASBh, called *bshad pa*, and ASVy, called *rnam bshad*.

[353] In China, the ASVy was quite surely more popular for study than the AS: The AS was translated into Chinese in 652 CE, only six years after the ASVy (646 CE). See LÜ CHENG in Enc.Bud., s.v. *Abhidharmasamuccaya*.

[354] Column E (DGE YE's record) begins with the Tibetans and does not mention the Indian lineage.

[355] Column I, the list of transmissions received by the fifth Dalai Lama.

[356] MARTIN, *ibid.*, p. 338.

find an explanation for the different lineages in assuming that Ye shes sde received the AS through Śīlendrabodhi and the ASVy through Jinamitra (in which case the Tibetan accounts would deal with slightly different lineages). Still, more probably, the Tibetan authors based their lineage accounts on different colophons in the *bstan 'gyur*: A, B, and G (which include Śīlendrabodhi) on the AS itself, and C, D, F, H, I (omitting Śīlendrabodhi) on the ASVy.

It is, by the way, most striking that the alleged ASBh and ASVy author ***Jinaputra** is not mentioned in the accounts of the Indian lineage, while Sthiramati appears consistently. I think it is true that "historically speaking, the Indian segment of the lineage tells us very little"[357], that is, that accounts were based on what Tibetan authors thought an AS lineage in India could have been. But even if the Indian part of the lineages is mere fiction, the inclusion of Sthiramati at the expense of *Jinaputra needs some explanation. The imagined scenario was probably that Asaṅga passed on the AS lineage to his brother, the famous Yogācāra and Abhidharma master Vasubandhu. The latter's foremost disciple in the field of Abhidharma was Sthiramati.[358] There was possibly no place for *Jinaputra to fit in between those three illustrious masters.[359]

As for the **transition from the Indian to the Tibetan scholars**, most AS lineage

---

[357] *Ibid.*

[358] As stated above, already BU STON noticed some contradictions in the traditional chronology of Vasubandhu and his disciples. He and other traditional authors (see TSONAWA, *Indian Buddhist Pandits*, p. 35f.) nonetheless commonly held that Sthiramati was the disciple of Asaṅga's brother Vasubandhu, the author of the AKBh. FRAUWALLNER's dating ("Landmarks", p. 137) of Sthiramati to about 510-570 CE is nowadays commonly accepted in the field of Buddhology. See SCHMITHAUSEN, *External World*, p. 44, BUESCHER, *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya*, p. vii f., n. 2. Also DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 194) follows this dating of STHIRAMATI, even though he does not accept the two-Vasubandhu theory and proposes a date from ca. 350 to ca. 430 CE for the Kośakāra (FRAUWALLNER: ca. 400-480). DELEANU consequently suggests that "details concerning the dates of some Buddhist masters might have to be modified accordingly". The only contribution I can make to this issue is that, as far as the *karman* section of the AS is concerned, the few additional comments in the ASVy (ascribed to STHIRAMATI) contain no doctrines or lingual peculiarities that would necessitate a date much later than the final redaction of the AS itself.

With the above dating, there is a gap of about two hundred years between the death of Sthiramati and the lifetime of Pūrṇavardhana, who supposedly lived in the second half of the eighth century. DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 92, n. 12) reasonably states that Pūrṇavardhana was probably not a direct disciple of Sthiramati but a later scholar in his lineage. DELEANU (*op.cit.*, p. 193f.) has also analyzed the transmission lineage of the *Vajracchedika-prajñāpāramitā-śāstra*, which goes through Vasubandhu, who had received the basic text from his brother Asaṅga. After those two, not any master from the traditional AS lineage records appears in that lineage. Although its historicity is not established, the *Vajracchedika-prajñāpāramitā-śāstra* lineage creates no historical problems, gaps or overlaps.

[359] I presuppose that the AS lineages discussed by MARTIN aim at completeness. Still, if one looks at the lineage of the ritual to generate *bodhicitta*, as explained in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, it is hardly historical and does not aim at completeness. The transmission starts with Maitreya and then goes through Asaṅga, Vasubandhu, Candragomin, and Atiśa. See WANGCHUK, *Resolve*, p. 176f.

accounts proceed on the base of the assumption that that the lineage of instruction should go from the Indian translators (Śīlendrabodhi or Jinamitra) to the Tibetan translator (Ye shes sde), and from the latter to other Tibetan scholars. No one omits the alleged translator Ye shes sde, even though it would be theoretically possible, to my knowledge, that the main lineage of scholastic *teaching* transmission would bypass the official translator.[360] That would not be possible in the case of a tantric *reading* transmission (Skt. *āgama*, Tib. *lung*). I therefore suspect that the *words* of the text may have been as important in its transmission lineage as scholastic brilliance in its exposition.

One crucial point for that transition could be the expression ***gtan la 'bab pa*** in the colophons. The words can be translated as "definitely settle" or "establish definitely",[361] but what does that mean concretely? gZhan dga'[362] glosses that term as "[established] through teaching and listening" (*'chad nyan kyis [gtan la phab pa]*). *If* the gloss is accurate, it could either imply that the translators got feedback on their revised translation during a teaching series, only after which they would publish (i.e. "establish") the official final version. Or, more probably, the original translators "establish" the new translation in the scholarly world by means of an initial teaching series on the text, which implies that the finishing of a translation project could be the start of a Tibetan teaching transmission.[363] If, as SKILLING (*Mahāsūtras*, vol. 2, p. 112) proposes, the title of *zhu chen gyi lo tsā ba* actually indicates an official position as "chief-editor-cum-translator", it was probably his responsibility to officially approve of a final revision of the draft (≈ *zhus*), which was then written down nicely as an official MS and presented to the scholastic world (≈ *gtan pa phab pa*). Still, to my knowledge, the ancient chronicles provide no evidence for such a necessary implication of *gtan la 'bab pa*. In the ASBh$_t$ (ad ASBh 96,12), *gtan la dbab (/phab) pa* stands for the genre *upadeśa* (roughly, "instruction"), and that Sanskrit term is rendered as *man ngag* ("instruction", originally rather "oral instruction") or *lung 'bogs pa* ("bestowing a textual transmission, *āgama*") in other contexts.[364] Those connotations are surely interesting, but it seems that gZhan dga's above-mentioned gloss is based on lexical sources rather than historical knowledge.[365]

---

[360] According to column A (NYANG RAL's chronicle) the lineage went through Ka ba dpal brtsegs, Klu'i rgyal mtshan and Ye shes sde to sBas rgyal ba'i ye shes, even though the latter is considered a disciple of Ka ba dpal brtsegs and Klu'i rgyal mtshan. That suggests that the chronicler felt compelled to mention Ye shes sde.

[361] See ZIMMERMANN, *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra*, p. 213, DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 91, n. 2.

[362] AS-gZhan-dga', fol. 205b6.

[363] In the case of the lineage mentioning Jinamitra and then three Tibetans, the (imagined or true) scenario was maybe that Jinamitra initially taught the AS$_t$ to the three Tibetans in the presence of Śīlendrabodhi.

[364] See the electronic version of YBh-Index-CST, s.v. *upadeśa*. On the expression *gtan la dbab pa'i gzhung* in the YBh, see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 176 and p. 210f., n. 42. There, *gtan la dbab pa* most probably stands for *viniścaya* ("determination"). See also AHN, *Lehre von den Kleśas*, p. 3f.

[365] As I cannot pursue the issue further here, I provisionally refer to KRANG DBYI SUN, ed., *Tshig mdzod chen mo*, s.v. *gtan la phab pa'i sde*, according to which the *gtan la phab pa* genre provides

For the time being, I can only present the above patches of information on *gtan la 'bab pa*, without clarifying its meaning decisively.

Some Features of the $ASVy_t$: Examples

I have, above, discussed the historiographical sources which, as we have seen, raise a few doubts about the history of the $ASVy_t$. With some questions being raised, the next step is thus to look at the text directly trying to find out what happened. It can first be observed that the translation of the ASVy relies heavily on those of the AS and ASBh: Comparing the AS_t and $ASBh_t$ with the corresponding passages in the $ASVy_t$ one finds them as a rule almost identical. There are a few exceptions, such as $ASVy_t$ *rnyed par sla ba ma yin* against AS_t [*thun*] *mong ba ma yin* (ad AS 55,12-13, **sulabha*), and I believe those corrections stem from Nyi ma rgyal mtshan, and possibly his collaborator Grags pa rgyal mtshan, directly.

How, then, did Nyi ma rgyal mtshan proceed as an editor, did he use and follow a Sanskrit MS, and how did he make use of the Tibetan AS and ASBh translations? To answer those questions, I would present some features of the $ASVy_t$ in comparison to other textual witnesses.

1a.) To judge in how far the $ASVy_t$ revision was actually done "in accordance with the Sanskrit text", I first present some sample passages from the *karman* section where $ASVy_t$ reads against $ASBh_t$, in accordance with the Sanskrit text of the ASBh (and, presumably, the ASVy).[366]

°*lobha* (ASBh 63,21)	*'dod chags* ($ASBh_t$)	*chags pa* ($ASVy_t$)	貪 ($ASVy_c$)
yad asmin janman[i] (ASBh 64,24)	*gang gi tshe de la* ($ASBh_t$)	*gang tshe de la* ($ASVy_t$)	於 此 生 中 ($ASVy_c$)
°*saṃtānapariṇāma* (ASBh 64,26)	*rgyur gyur* ($ASBh_t$)	*rgyun 'gyur* ($ASVy_t$)	相 續 轉 變 ($ASVy_c$)
bhavitavyam (ASBh 64,28)	*rnam par smin par byed do* ($ASBh_t$)	*myong bar byed do*[367] ($ASVy_t$)	受異熟 ($ASVy_c$)
asādhyam (ASBh 67,15)	*lam sgrub du med pa* ($ASBh_t$)	*sgrub tu med pa* ($ASVy_t$)	[om.] ($ASVy_c$)

---

explanations on the characteristics of all phenomena. For that reason, all Abhidharma scriptures are considered to belong to that genre.

[366] As stated above, both AS_t and $ASBh_t$ are generally very accurate translations. I am not aware of any gross mistakes in either of the two that were repeated in the $ASVy_t$. At times the translations are clumsy, hardly intelligible without reference to the Sanskrit original, e.g. ad ASBh 72,12-13, without the $ASVy_t$ version providing any improvement.

[367] The $ASVy_t$ translation is not closer to the ASBh in the choice of words, but in its meaning.

yā tasmād dauḥśīlyād viratiḥ (ASBh 68,26)	*'chal ba'i tshul khrims te*[368] *spong ba gang yin pa'o* (ASBh$_t$)	*'chal ba'i tshul khrims de spong ba gang yin pa'o* (ASVy$_t$)	[om.] (ASVy$_c$)
anujñātam (ASBh 71,21)	*bka' stsal pa* (ASBh$_t$)	*gnang ba* ASVy$_{t,D}$[369]	所聽 (ASVy$_c$)
°tayā yāvacchakyaṃ saṃpādanāt / (ASBh 72,15)	*phyir te / bsgrub nus pa'i bar du'o* // (ASBh$_t$)	*phyir te / bsgrub nus pa'i bar du'i phyir ro* // (ASVy$_t$)	其所能而修習故 (ASVy$_c$)
sattvānāṃ (ASBh 73,16)	*sems can thams cad la* (ASBh$_t$)	*sems can rnams la* (ASVy$_t$)	[om.] (ASVy$_c$)

1b.) A look at the colophons of the ASBh MS, the ASBh$_t$, and the ASVy$_t$ reveals that the ASVy$_t$ is at times more in accordance with the ASBh MS that the ASBh$_t$:

ASBh 156,26-29: *[**samyaguccayatvāyātanatāṃ copādāyety**[370] aviparītenopāyena yāvadbuddhatvaprāpaṇād ity arthaḥ //] ity abhidharmasamuccaye bhāṣyataḥ sāṃkathyaviniścayo nāma pañcamaḥ samuccayaḥ samāptaḥ // likhāpitam idaṃ paṇḍitavaidyaśrīamaracandreṇa jagadbuddhatvasampade // iti /.*[371]

ASBh$_{t,P}$ 143a8-b1: *[yang dag par mtho ba'i gnas yin pa'i phyir zhes bya ba ni phyin ci ma log pa'i thabs kyis sangs rgyas nyid kyi bar du thob par byed pa'i phyir zhes bya ba'i tha tshig go //] chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i bshad pa / slob dpon*[372] *rgyal ba'i sras kyis mdzad pa rdzogs so //*

ASVy$_{t,P}$ 361b7-362a1: *[yang dag par mthong ba'i*[373] *gnas yin pa'i phyir zhes bya ba ni phyin ci ma log pa'i thabs kyis sangs rgyas nyid kyi*[374] *bar du thob par byed pa'i phyir zhes bya ba'i tha tshig go //] yang dag pa'i gtam rnam par nges pa zhes bya ba ste / kun*

---

[368] This might as well be a scribal error

[369] ASVy$_{t,PG}$ wrongly read *snang ba.*

[370] AS$_{t,P}$ 141b1: *[yang dag par mtho ba'i gnas yin pa'i phyir ro //] chos mngon pa kun las btus pa slob dpon (*AS$_{t,PD}$ *dpon;* AS$_{t,G}$ *dkon) thogs med kyis mdzad pa rdzogs so //.*

[371] ASBh$_{MS}$ *pade // iti /;* ASBh$_{Pradhan}$ *pada iti /.* The ASBh MS contains a margin notation below the last sentence which unfortunately does not come out clear enough on the photograph to read.

[372] ASBh$_{t,PG}$ *slob dpon.* ASBh$_{t,D}$ *slob dpon chen po* seems to be a liberal addition by the sDe-dge editors.

[373] The reading *mthong ba'i* for *mtho ba'i* (*uccayatva*) appears to be a miscorrection, neglecting the Sanskrit original against AS$_t$ and ASBh$_t$–a typical type 2 and 4 mistake. The revisor or editor here misses quite a crucial point in the meaning of *Abhidharmasamuccaya.*

[374] ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *kyi;* ASVy$_{t,G}$ *kyis.*

nas btus pa lnga pa'o //[375] *chos mngon pa kun nas btus*[376] *pa'i rnam par bshad pa*[377] *slob dpon rgyal ba'i sras kyis mdzad pa rdzogs so //.*

ASVy$_c$ 774a4-6: [正所集者。謂由無倒結集方便乃至證得佛菩提故。]大乘阿毘達磨雜集論

[卷第十] 。[378]

2.) In the following examples, ASVy$_t$ reads against ASBh$_t$, although the meaning of ASBh text is already accurately rendered there. ASVy$_t$ supplies more liberal or even wrong renderings.

alaṃkārādi (ASBh 63,9)	*rgyan la sogs pa'o* (ASBh$_t$)	*rgyan la sogs par bsgyur ba'o* (ASVy$_t$)	造莊嚴具等 (ASVy$_c$)[379]
yojayitavyam (ASBh 63,23)	*sbyar bar bya'o* (ASBh$_t$)	*sbyar ro* (ASVy$_t$)[380]	思 (ASVy$_c$)
vā (ASBh 63,24)	*'am* (ASBh$_t$)	*dang* (ASVy$_t$)	若 (ASVy$_c$)
vastu (ASBh 64,3)	*gzhi* (ASBh$_t$)	*rgyu* (ASVy$_t$)	事 (ASVy$_c$)
abhiniveśa (ASBh 64,15-16)	*mngon par zhen pa* (ASBh$_t$)	*mngon par shes pa* (ASVy$_t$)	執著(ASVy$_c$)
upapadya (ASBh 64,28)	*skyes nas* (ASBh$_t$)	*skye gnas* (ASVy$_t$)	生 (ASVy$_c$)
paraṃparā (ASBh 66,10)	*gcig nas gcig tu brgyud pa'i* (ASBh$_t$)	*phan tshun brgyud de* (ASVy$_t$)	展轉 (ASVy$_c$)

[375] This phrase is contained in the ASBh MS, but has no equivalent in ASBh$_t$ or in ASVy$_c$.

[376] ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *kun nas btus*; ASVy$_{t,G}$ *kun btus*.

[377] ASVy$_{t,D}$ *pa*; ASBh$_{t,PG}$ *pa dang*. The reading "*dang*" can not result from a superficial combination of the AS$_t$ and ASBh$_t$ texts, wherefore I do not consider it a mistake of type 7 (on which see below). Still, it is a bit irritating to see it here.

[378] The number of Chinese scrolls naturally does not come from the Sanskrit colophon. Also the ASBh$_{t,P}$ contains a *bam po* count after the translator's colophon ("*bam po bcu yod do //*"), while there is no *bam po* count in end of ASBh$_{t,D}$ or ASVy$_t$.

[379] I assume 造 to be an addition by the Chinese translator.

[380] This is rendering of the Skt. gerundive is equally valid (see HODGE, *Tibetan*, p. 41), but much less explicit and rather uncommon. In the YBh-Index-CST, for example, far more than ninety percent of all Sanskrit terms ending in *-tavya* are rendered in Tibetan with an auxiliary *bya*, (see also MaVyu 1546-1549, 2150 etc.) among the few exceptions being, for example, *kartavya* = *bya ba* (dto. MaVyu 1318).

vaireniryātanakāmānām (ASBh 66,23-24)	*sha glon par 'dod pa rnams* (ASBh$_t$)	*zhes 'gras pa la lan ldon pa* (ASVy$_t$)	爲除怨等 (ASVy$_c$)
veditavyaḥ (ASBh 67,5)	*rig par bya'o* (ASBh$_t$)	*lta bar bya'o* (ASVy$_t$)	知 (ASVy$_c$)
ṣaṇḍapaṇḍakānāṃ (ASBh 68,21)	*za ma dang ma ning rnams la* (ASBh$_t$)	*za ma dang ma ning gnyis la* (ASVy$_t$)[381]	扇搋半擇迦等 (ASVy$_c$)
kāyavāksampattyā sampanno (ASBh 72,1)	*lus dang ngag phun sum tshogs pas phun sum tshogs pa* (ASBh$_t$)	*lus dang ngag phun sum tshogs pa* (ASVy$_t$)[382]	身語具足圓滿 (ASVy$_c$)
avyavakīrṇatayaikāntaśubhatvāt (ASBh 72,3-4)	*ma 'dres pa'i phyir te // gcig tu dge ba'i phyir ro //* (ASBh$_t$)	*ma 'dres pa'i phyir ro // gcig tu dge ba'i phyir ro //* (ASVy$_t$)	所不能雜。一向淨故。(ASVy$_c$)
pareṣām (ASBh 72,5)	*gzhan dag* (ASBh$_t$)	*gzhan* (ASVy$_t$)	他 (ASVy$_c$)
kāyavāk° (ASBh 72,5-6)	*lus dang ngag* (ASBh$_t$)	*lus dang ngag dang yid* (ASVy$_t$)[383]	身語 (ASVy$_c$)
svadoṣaguṇāviṣkaraṇa-chādanārtham[384] (ASBh 72,7-8)	*rang gi nyes pa dang yon tan sgrogs dang mi spyoms pa'i phyir ro* (ASBh$_t$)	*rang gi nyes pa mthol zhing yon tan 'chab pa'i phyir ro* (ASVy$_t$)[385]	隱自功德顯自過失 (ASVy$_c$)

[381] The Tib. dual here renders the Skt. *dvandva* compound, while, instead of the Skt. plural, Tib. expresses the same meaning as *pars pro toto*.

[382] ASVy$_t$ here reads against both, ASBh$_t$ and AS$_t$.

[383] ASVy$_t$ here reads against both, ASBh$_t$ and AS$_t$.

[384] For *°āviṣkaraṇa°*, ASBh$_{T,MS}$ *°āviṣkambhaṇa°*. See also my notes on ASBh 72,7-8.

[385] This ASVy$_t$ reading is clearly an improvement against the ASBh$_t$, in so far as it is easier to understand, but it is still a deviation from the Sanskrit text. Although the ASVy$_c$ word order is similar to the ASVy$_t$, I assume that the Chinese translators, just like the ASVy$_t$ editor, wanted to make the sentence more comprehensible.

ātman (ASBh 72,12)	*bdag* (ASBh$_t$)	*rgyud* (ASVy$_t$)	自 (ASVy$_c$)
bhogān (ASBh 72,13)	*logs spyod pa rnams ... la* (ASBh$_t$)	*longs spyod ... la* (ASVy$_t$)	捨財 (ASVy$_c$)
karmayonīyāḥ (ASBh 72,22)	*las kyi skye gnas pa dag go* (ASBh$_t$)	*las kyi skye gnas las gyur ro* (ASVy$_t$)	從業所生 (ASVy$_c$)
yathāyogam (ASBh 73,7)	*ji ltar mthun mthun du sbyar ro* (ASBh$_t$)	*ji ltar rigs pa rnams so* (ASVy$_t$)	如其所應 (ASVy$_c$)
aprameyam anargheyam (ASBh 73,17)	*rin che ba dang dpag tu med pa'i* (ASBh$_t$)	*rin po che dpag tu med pa'i* (ASVy$_t$)	[om.] (ASVy$_c$)
āvarjana (ASBh 73,22)	*'dun par bya ba* (ASBh$_t$)	*'dul bar bya ba* (ASVy$_{t,P}$) *gdul bar bya ba* (ASVy$_{t,D}$)	爲欲攝化 (ASVy$_c$)
anyānyair (ASBh 73,24)	*gzhan dang gzhan dag gis* (ASBh$_t$)	*gzhan dag gis* (ASVy$_t$)	以無量種 (ASVy$_c$)
buddhakṛtyānuṣṭhānakarma (ASBh 74,1-3)	*sangs rgyas kyi mdzad pa sgrub pa'i phrin las* (ASBh$_t$)	*sangs rgyas kyi mdzad pa sgrub pa'i phrin las kyi las* (ASVy$_t$)[386]	諸佛應所作事業用 (ASVy$_c$)

The term *ālayavijñāna* which occurs at ASBh 64,22, has been translated in the ASBh$_t$ by the standard rendering *kun gzhi rnam par shes pa*, while we find *kun tu len pa'i rnam par shes pa* in its stead in the ASVy$_t$. While *len pa'i rnam par shes pa* is a common rendering for Skt. *ādānavijñāna* (s. MaVyu 2018), I could not find any occurrence of *kun tu len pa'i rnam par shes pa* in another source.[387] That it stands for *ādānavijñāna* is quite possible because *kun tu* need not necessarily have an actual referent in Sanskrit. Considering that the ASVy$_t$ editor was rather liberal in the choice of his equivalents, it seems quite probable that *kun tu len pa'i rnam par shes pa* was his original creation.

---

386 ASVy$_t$ here reads against both, ASBh$_t$ and AS$_t$. The ASVy$_t$ editor (NYI MA RGYAL MTSHAN?) supplied the word *las* for *karman*, either not realizing that *phrin las* stands for *karman*, or thinking that *phrin las kyi las* would convey the meaning of *karman* in this context more clearly to the Tibetan reader.

387 On the semantics of *ādānavijñāna* and *ālayavijñāna*, see BUESCHER, *Vijñānavāda*, pp. 142-148.

The issue of this equivalent in the ASVy$_t$ has been discussed by HAKAMAYA (*Yuishikishisō*, p. 353, n. 16). Firstly, HAKAMAYA does not discuss the Tibetan expression *kun tu len pa'i rnam par shes pa* itself, neither does he refer to any other source that would use it. Secondly, he proposes that the ASVy MS in the possession of Nyi ma rgyal mtshan might have read *ādānavijñāna*.[388] I do not agree with HAKAMAYA, as ASVy$_c$ uses the standard Chinese equivalent for *ālayavijñāna*,[389] and rather assume that *kun tu len pa'i rnam par shes pa* is one of the less useful and liberal alterations by the ASVy$_t$ editor.[390]

3.) Major improvements against AS$_t$ are rare, but occur:

sulabhaḥ ... na bhavet (AS 55,13-16)	*thun mong ba ma yin no* (AS$_t$)	*rnyed par sla ba ma yin no* (ASVy$_t$)	不易可得 (ASVy$_c$, AS$_c$)

4.) The ASVy$_t$ also often wrongly reads against the AS$_t$:

**narakatiryakpreteṣv apāyadurgati°* (AS 61,10-11)	*sems can dmyal ba dang dud 'gro dang yi dags kyi ngan song ngan 'gro* the (AS$_t$)	*sems can dmyal ba dang dud 'gro dang yi dags dang ngan song ngan 'gro* (ASVy$_t$)[391]	三惡趣 (AS$_c$, ASVy$_c$)

5.) The majority of the changes in ASVy$_t$ are of minor relevance and do not constitute a fundamental improvement to the text. One wonders what the editor's motivation may have been.

---

388 "これは新たに得た原本に*ādāna-vijñāna*とあったためかと思われる."

389 謂令習氣增益。於阿賴耶識中長養異熟種子故, ASVy$_c$ 728a7-8.

390 In Indian Buddhism, the two terms were generally considered synonyms (see, e.g. NAKAMURA, et al., *Iwanami bukkyōjiten*, s.v. 阿頼耶識[はたらき]), although some Chinese translators held *ādānavijñāna* to be the seventh *vijñāna* (Enc.Bud., s.v. *ādānavijñāna*). At MSg I.4-5., Asaṅga proves that *ādānavijñāna* is a synonym of *ālayavijñāna*. Also at AS 12,1-2, *ādānavijñāna* is listed among the synonyms of *ālayavijñāna* (see also ASVy$_c$ 701a25, 701b1: 阿陀那識). According to SUGURO (*Shokiyuishiki*, p. 12), "*ālayavijñāna*" is normally used in the YBh, and "*ādānavijñāna*" only in the *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra* and quotations from it, and the latter term probably stems from the SaNiSū originally (see Schmithausen, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 49, and DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 176). The equivalent 阿陀那識 (i.e., *ādānavijñāna*) is used in YBh$_c$ where YBh$_t$ has *len pa'i rnam par shes pa* (see YBh-Index-CST, s.v. 阿陀那識) without the prefix *kun tu*.

Strangely enough, Paramārtha uses the Chinese equivalent to **amala(vi)jṇāna* in places were XUANZANG's translation of the YBh presupposes **āśrayaparivṛtti*. See DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 246, n. 278. Although this seems to be quite a different problem (see *ibid.*, p. 198), it demonstrates the uncertainty of some translators (or, of the textual tradition) in dealing with the terms related to the *ālayavijñāna*.

391 As far as I see, the third *dang* is misplaced and it cannot be considered a final *dang* concluding a list. In such a case *dang* should be followed by a summary numeral (see BEYER, *Classical Tibetan*, p. 240f., **mthu ser brtad dang gsum*).

**katham* (AS 60,2-3)	*ji ltar ... zhe na* (AS$_{t}$)	*ji ltar* (ASVy$_{t}$)	云何 (ASVy$_{c}$)
°*vyastāḥ* (ASBh 63,18)	*so so ba* (ASBh$_{t}$)	*so so* (ASVy$_{t}$)	别 (ASVy$_{c}$)
**katamā* (AS 53,15)	*gang zhe na* (AS$_{t}$)	*gang* (ASVy$_{t}$)	云何 (ASVy$_{c}$)
ity ucyate (ASBh 66,12)	*zhes bya zhe na* (ASBh$_{t}$)	*zhes bshad zhe na* (ASVy$_{t}$)	名 (ASVy$_{c}$)
**yathā* (AS 55,4-5)	*ji lta bar* (AS$_{t}$)	*ji ltar* (ASVy$_{t}$)	如 (ASVy$_{c}$)
ity ucyate (ASBh 71,19)	*ces bya'o* (ASBh$_{t}$)	*ces brjod do* (ASVy$_{t}$)	名爲 (ASVy$_{c}$)

6.) In one instance, both the ASBh$_{t}$ and the ASVy$_{t}$ readings are equally inaccurate.[392]

yad vā yasya svalakṣaṇakṛtyam (ASBh 63,8)	*yang na gang gi mtshan nyid kyi byed pa gang yin pa* (ASBh$_{t}$)	*yang na rang gi mtshan nyid kyi byed pa gang yin pa....* (ASVy$_{t}$)	或復諸法自相所作 (ASVy$_{t}$)

As far as I see, the correct reading would be *yang na gang rang gi mtshan nyid gang yin pa*. It seems that the ASVy$_{t}$ editor made an accurate correction to the text, while dropping another element (the first *gang*) for stylistic reasons.

7.) As for the syntactical congruency of the ASVy$_{t}$ text, it contains conjunctions (*dang*, ...) that stem from a sentence in the AS$_{t}$ text, followed by explanations from the ASBh, which frequently results in sentences where the conjunction no longer makes any sense. For example:

gang sngon goms par byas pa dang / gnas la gnas pa dang / ... (AS$_{t}$ ad AS 56,3-5)	*gang sngon goms par byas pa de yang stobs dang ldan pa ...* (ASBh$_{t}$)	*gang sngon goms par byas pa dang* / de yang stobs dang ldan pa ... (ASVy$_{t}$)	又先所串習名強力業 (ASVy$_{c}$)
zhing dang sems kyi mngon par 'du byed pas ... (AS$_{t}$ ad AS 56,5-6)	*zhing ni ma gsod pa la sogs pa'o // sems kyi mngon par 'du byed pa ni ...* (ASBh$_{t}$)	zhing dang *ma gsod pa la sogs pa'o //* sems kyi mngon par 'du byed pas ... (ASVy$_{t}$)	又由田故發強力業。謂害母等業。又由心加行故... (ASVy$_{c}$)

---

392 Cf. also ROSPATT (*Momentariness*, p. 118, n. 262), who shows one instance where ASVy$_{t,D}$ 181b2 reads *'gyur* with ASBh$_{t,PD}$, and AS$_{t,P}$, against AS$_{t,D}$ (*'byung*) even though the latter reading is probably most appropriate. I wonder whether *'gyur* should be treated as the original *lectio difficilior* which was levelled by the AS$_{t,D}$ editors but not by THAR LO and others.

8.) The "additional leaf" presents a section where the $ASVy_t$ translator could not revert to AS_t or $ASBh_t$. As could be expected by now, the translation is at times quite liberal or even wrong. Some examples:

āsevitair ("ASBh 65,8")	*la brten [cing]* ($ASVy_t$)[393]	*kun du bsten*[394] *[dang]* ($AKBh_t$)[395]
tad eṣāṃ vipākaphalam ("ASBh 65,8")	*de rnams su rnam par smin par myong bar*[396] *byas nas* ($ASVy_t$)	*'di ni de dag gi rnam par smin pa'i 'bras bu yin no* ($AKBh_t$)
sa ced icchatvam āgacchati ("ASBh 65,8-9")	*'ongs pa na* ($ASVy_t$)	*brgya la 'di lta bur ... 'ongs na*[397] *yang* ($AKBh_t$)
sa[sapat]nadāraḥ ("ASBh 65,10")	*bud med rnams la 'bad pa dang bcas pa* ($ASVy_t$)[398]	*dgra dang bcas pa'i chung ma can* ($AKBh_t$)

Conclusion

For the most part, the $ASVy_t$ text is in accordance with the respective sections in the AS_t and the $ASBh_t$. There is thus no trace of an ancient $ASVy_t$ version that would be as jumbled as Nyi ma rgyal mtshan's colophon claims, although such a version might have existed. A very few improvements against $ASBh_t$ are visible which must have been made based on a Sanskrit MS (type 1a., and for AS_t, type 3). From a comparison of the colophons (1b.) it even comes into the range of possibility that those corrections were made based on the Ngor MS of the ASBh, while the translation of the $ASBh_t$ was made based on a different MS. On the other hand, most of the changes are minor stylistic variations on the Tibetan text which have no connection to the Sanskrit text whatsoever (type 5), and in many cases, the changes are clearly wrong (such as $ASVy_t$ *lta bar bya'o* for $ASBh_t$, *rig par bya'o*, ASBh *veditavyaḥ*) or at least constitute a more liberal rendering of the Sanskrit, with "improvements" such as *rgyud* for *bdag* (Skt. *ātman*, Chin. 自) being clearly ideological and even as such contestable (type 2 and for AS_t, type 4). It also occurs that a particle was accurately added at the expense of another, equally accurate particle (type 6). If we assume that an $ASVy_t$ text that was just the combination of the ancient AS_t and $ASBh_t$ translations existed before the time of the $ASVy_t$ revision (which

---

393 On the problem of *bsten* or brten for Skt. */sev*, see my notes ad ASBh 65,14-16, *atyāsevita*.

394 $AKBh_{t,P}$ *bsten*; $AKBh_{t,D}$ *bstan*.

395 For the sake of completeness, it must be said that *bahulīkṛtair* is translated as *lan mang du byas pa thams cad kyis* in $AKBh_t$, while $ASVy_t$ simply reads *mang du byas pas*.

396 $ASVy_{t,PN}$ *par myong bar*; $ASVy_{t,DC}$ *pa myong bar*; $ASVy_{t,G}$ *par*. $ASVy_{t,G}$ is here possibly corrected on the base of $AKBh_t$.

397 $AKBh_{t,D}$ *na*; $AKBh_{t,P}$ *nas*.

398 The $ASVy_t$ translator quite surely misread the difficult compound °*sapatna*° for ° *sayatna* °, *pa* and *ya* being in some MSS graphically almost identical (the issue is actually more complex, see my notes ad ASBh 65,10).

is, anyhow, doubtful, considering the ancient catalogues), the revision generally did more harm than good to the text. If, on the other hand, Nyi ma rgyal mtshan's work consisted mainly of discarding the faulty translation he mentions and replacing it with his own version, a combination of AS_t and $ASBh_t$ with some minor alterations, the work he produced was generally more accurate where he followed the ancient translations, and less where he added his own.

As for the "additional leaf", where $ASVy_t$ is rich in mistakes (type 8), this may either reflect the original, unrevised translation as described in the revisor's colophon, or it is Nyi ma rgyal mtshan's own production. In either case, the additional leaf shows us that a) the quality of the translation is far lower than in passages where there is a AS_t or $ASBh_t$ parallel, and b) the revisor did not use the more accurate parallel in $AKBh_t$. Still, even though his work as an editor and compiler was not flawless (see type 7), the "revised" $ASVy_t$ version is quite accurate and serves as a solid working basis for AS studies in Tibet up to the present day. Still, even though his work as an editor and compiler was not flawless (see type 7), the "revised" $ASVy_t$ version is quite accurate and serves as a solid working basis for AS studies in Tibet up to the present day.

A Commentary by Ācārya Jñānamitra?

Various sources mention an Indian AS commentary by Jñānamitra (Tib. Ye shes bshes gnyen). The *Blue Annals* state that Śākya Śrībhadra translated that commentary at some point between 1204 and 1212.[399] Named *A Lamp for the Important Points*, Jñānamitra's commentary is contained in a recent list of Tibetan works in the People's Republic of China,[400] wherefore I assume that Jñānamitra is not simply a misreading of Jinamitra. Nonetheless, I could not gain access to that commentary. It is not preserved in any of the existing *bsTan 'gyur*s. The catalogues of the Tibetan canon ascribe only two works to authors named Jñānamitra,[401] a commentary on the Heart Sūtra[402] and a commentary on the *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa tshul brgya lnga bcu pa*.[403] According to MARTIN

---

[399] ROERICH, *Blue Annals: Part II*, p. 1069:"He spent the summer retreat at Srin po ri, and translated the commentary on the Abhidharmasamuccaya by the Ācārya Jñānamitra (Ye śes gśes gñen; Abhidharmasamuccayavyākhyā nāma, Tg. *Sems tsam*, No. 4054)."*Deb ther sngon po*, vol. *ba*, fol. 4a3-4: *srin po rir dbyar gnas mdzad / mngon pa kun las btus kyi rnam bshad slob dpon ye shes bshes gnyen gyis mdzad pa bsgyur*. Note that ROERICH identifies Jñānamitra's commentary with the ASVy. He possibly he took "Ye shes bshes gnyen" (Jñānamitra) to refer to "Grags pa'i bshes gnyen" (Yaśomitra), just as "rGyal ba'i sras" (Jinaputra) has been identified as "rGyal po'i sras" (Yaśomitra) elsewhere. It therefore seems that ROERICH's identification of that text as the ASVy does not stand on solid ground.

[400] mTsho sngon Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, ed., *Bod kyi bstan bcos khag cig*, p. 611: *slob dpon ye shes bshes gnyen gyis mdzad pa'i mngon pa kun las btus pa'i 'grel ba gnad kyi sgron ma.*

[401] See LOPEZ, *Elaborations on Emptiness*, p. 14.

[402] P 5218, D 3819, translated in LOPEZ, *Elaborations on Emptiness*, pp. 141-150. According to LOPEZ (*op.cit.*, p. 14), that commentary is straightforward in style and close to the text of the Heart Sūtra. In so far, I would say, it is similar to the ASBh.

[403] P 3471, D 2647 (**Prajñāpāramitā-naya-śatapañcāśtikā*).

(*Tibskrit*, p. 929) there were at least two scholars by the name of Jñānamitra, the Kashmiri (Kha che) Jñānamitra and a scholar who was a "great pillar" (*ka chen*), that is an upholder of the doctrine at Vikramaśīla monastery. RUEGG (*Literature of the Madhyamaka School*, pp. 110 and 116), mentions a Jñānśrīmitra who was a contemporary of Nāropa at Vikramaśīla monastery. He is probably identical to the "mKhan po Dznyā na", a teacher of Rin chen bzang po.[404] Still, I found no source apart from the two mentioned above that would ascribe an AS commentary to any person called Jñānamitra.[405]

Tibetan Commentaries on the AS

The texts below are referred to as "commentaries on the AS" although they often comment on doctrines from the ASBh or ASVy, too. Further, my list only mentions those commentaries that deal with the whole text. Such a distinction has to be made because the AS exposition of mind and secondary mental factors (*citta - caitta*, Tib. *sems dang sems byung*) enjoyed a wide reception among Tibetan scholars, and so there are numerous commentaries that deal with that section of the AS exclusively.[406]

According to some historical sources, the AS was studied in western Tibet already in the eleventh century, mainly under Indian scholar 'Bum phrag gsum pa.[407] It even seems that the AS was much more important in Tibetan Abhidharma studies than the *Abhidharmakośa* during the first centuries of the latter spread of the doctrine (*phyi dar*) well into the 15th century,[408] to the extent that an account of lineage the could not be found at the time 'Gos Lo tsā ba wrote his *Blue Annals*.[409]

---

[404] See SNELLGROVE and SKORUPSKI, *Ladakh*, vol. 2, p. 105,15, but cf. p. 90.

[405] See CHIMPA and CHATTOPADHYAYA, transl., *Tāranātha's History*, p. 430f. for a list of works ascribed to Jñānamitra, Jñānaśrī and Jñānśrīmitra.

[406] See, e.g. DPA' RIS BLO BZANG RAB GSAL, "mNgon pa gong ma'i lugs bzhin sems dang sems byung rnam par bzhag pa."

[407] See, e.g., KRAMER, *rNgog blo ldan shes rab*, p. 43.

[408] See, e.g., DIEMBERGER, et al., *Feast of Miracles*, pp. 18 and 105.

[409] See ROERICH, *Blue Annals: Part I*, p. 346. The issue is of course not unimportant since the AKBh is now of much greater importance than the AS in Tibetan scholarship, probably due to the focus on Candrakīrti and Dharmakīrti (who mainly presuppose "Sautrāntika" Abhidharma). On the unclear transmission of the AKBh in the early *phyi dar* period, the rNying-ma scholar ZHE CHEN RGYAL TSHAB (1871-1926), for example, states: "Here the omniscient Dharmakara, 'Gos Lo tsā ba, and others have said that, what has spread from that lineage [of Jinamitra to Grum rgyal ba'i ye shes] is only the tradition of the "upper Abhidharma", and there was no teaching tradition of the *Kośa* that was carried on in a regular way. Still, although it possibly occurred that in this teaching tradition, it was mainly the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* that spread, the *Kośa* along with its commentary, too, must necessarily have come forth from this [tradition ...]." (*'dir kun mkhyen dharma ka ras / 'gos lo sogs kyis brgyud pa 'di nas dar ba ni mngon pa gong ma kho na yin la mdzod kyi bshad srol la brgyud pa bstar chags 'ded rgyu med smras kyang / bshad srol 'di la kun btus gtso cher dar ba ni byung srid mod kyi / mdzod 'grel dang bcas pa'ang 'di las nges par 'byung dgos te*, ZHE CHEN RGYAL TSHAB, *Chos 'byung*, p. 69f.).

The first Tibetan commentaries on the AS that are preserved were written after the time of 'Bum phrag gsum pa. The *Blue Annals* mentions an extensive commentary by Yar rGyal ba'i shes rab, a disciple of Rog Chos kyi brtson 'grus who promoted the study of the AS in the Yar-klungs area.[410] Unfortunately, that commentary is lost. Among Rog's disciples was also bCom ldan rig pa'i ral gri,[411] who wrote an AS commentary that was probably the starting point for several commentaries from the bKa' gdams pa lineage. That, at least, is my preliminary assumption. The AS commentaries from the bKa' gdams pa lineage (six in total) have only recently been published and time did not allow me to analyze their doctrinal content.[412]

Most of the Tibetan AS commentators were active in western Tibet, many of them in the monastery Bo-dong E where 'Bum phrag gsum pa had founded a college with a strong emphasis on AS studies.[413] dPang Lo tsā ba Blo gros brtan pa was an abbot of Bo-dong E,[414] and Bu ston Rin chen grub one of his disciples.[415] The alleged author of another AS commentary, Sa bzang Ma ti Paṇ chen, also known as 'Jam dbyangs blo gros, was equally a disciple of dPang Lo tsā ba and he had studied in Bu ston's main seat Zhwa-lu.[416] Sa bzang ma ti Paṇ chen's disciple Red mda' ba gZhon nu blo gros had also studied the "upper Abhidharma" with dPang Lo tsā ba's nephew Lo chen Byang chub rtse mo, another abbot of Bo-dong E.[417] Red mda' ba's disciple rGyal tshab Dar ma rin chen is counted as the main authority for Abhidharma studies among the dGe lugs pa up to the present day.[418] Bo dong paṇ chen Phyogs las rnam rgyal was a grand-nephew and disciple of Lo chen Byang chub rtse mo, and he became the third successor of dPang Lo tsā ba as the abbot of Bo-dong E.

The two later commentaries from the nineteenth and twentieth century were

---

410 ROERICH, *Blue Annals: Part I*, p. 345.

411 ROERICH, *Blue Annals: Part I*, p. 345.

412 Important aspects of the history of AS commentaries in Tibet were addressed in a presentation by Leonard VAN DER KUIJP titled "Notes on Jñānamitra's Commentary on the Abhidharmasamuccaya", presented at the Third Geumgang International Conference for Buddhist Studies, 2008. Even though I gained access to the respective handout in the final stages of this publication, I could not integrate the results of VAN DER KUIJP's thorough research into this publication.

413 See KRAMER, *rNgog blo ldan shes rab*, p. 43.

414 DIEMBERGER, et al., *Feast of Miracles*, p. 107.

415 DIEMBERGER, et al., *Feast of Miracles*, p. 107f.

416 NGAG DBANG BLO GROS GRAGS PA, *Jo nang pa'i chos 'byung*, p. 33. See also STEARNS, *The Buddha from Dolpo*, p. 187, n. 69.

417 Also Tsong kha pa's disciple mKhas grub dGe legs dpal bzang (later considered the first *paṇ chen bla ma*) had studied the "upper Abhidharma" with Red mda' ba. KO ZHUL GRAGS PA 'BYUNG GNAS and RGYAL BA BLO BZANG MKHAS GRUB, *Ming mdzod*, p. 220.

418 Red mda' ba had received the novice name gZhon nu blo gros from Sa bzang. See KO ZHUL GRAGS PA 'BYUNG GNAS and RGYAL BA BLO BZANG MKHAS GRUB, *Ming mdzod*, p. 1619.

written by rNying-ma scholars associated with the non-sectarian (*ris med*) movement and affiliated to the monastery of rDzogs-chen: 'Ju Mi pham, and gZhan phan chos kyi snang ba.

'JAD PA GZHON NU BYANG CHUB (11th-12th c.)

• Title: *Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa ṭīkka shes bya thams cad gsal bar byed pa'i sgron me*

• Publication details: In DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG, ed., *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 40, pp. 11-536.

• Section on *karman*: pp. 335,4-391,8

• Notes: a.) The edition by the DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG (in *dbu med*) is preceded by a table of contents prepared by the editors. b.) I gained access to this commentary in the final stages of this publication only, wherefore I could neither evaluate its doctrinal content nor pursue further research about the author.

BZAD PA RING MO (12th c.)

• Title: *Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i rnam par bshad pa gsal ba'i rgyan*

• Publication details: In DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG, ed., *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 41, pp. 11-373.

• Section on *karman*: C. pp. 279,2-298,2

• Notes: a.) The edition by the DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG (in *dbu med*) is preceded by a table of contents prepared by the editors. b.) I gained access to this commentary in the final stages of this publication only wherefore I could neither evaluate its doctrinal content nor pursue further research about the author.

(Author unknown)

• Title: "Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i bshad pa rnam bshad snying po legs bshad kyi 'od zer"

• Publication details: In DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG, ed., *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 41, pp. 379-602.

• Section on *karman*: A first glance at this work suggests that it deals with topics from the Lakṣaṇasamuccaya section of the AS only.

• Notes: a.) The edition by the DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG (in *dbu med*) is preceded by a table of contents prepared by the editors. 2.) I gained access to this commentary in the final stages of this publication only, wherefore I could neither evaluate its doctrinal content nor pursue further

research about the author.

'GAR DHARMA SMON LAM (12th. c.)

• Title: *Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i bshad pa shes bya gsal byed*

• Publication details: In DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG, ed., *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 42, pp. 11-560.

• Section on *karman*: pp. 330,6-366,3

• Notes: a.) The edition by the DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG (in *dbu med*) is preceded by a table of contents prepared by the editors. b.) I gained access to this commentary in the final stages of this publication only wherefore I could neither evaluate its doctrinal content nor pursue further research about the author.

BCOM LDAN RIG PA'I RAL GRI (1227-1305)

• Title: *Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i rnam bshad rgyan gyi me tog* (abbr. AS-Rig-ral)

• Publication details: In DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG, ed., *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 57, pp. 11-665.

• Section on *karman*: Pp. 431-477.

• Notes: a.) The edition by the DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG is preceded by a table of contents prepared by the editors. The entry on the *karman* section is slightly inaccurate, for it begins on fol. 199a, not on fol. 197. b.) I gained access to this most important commentary in the final stages of this publication only wherefore I could not evaluate its doctrinal content. See also VAN DER KUIJP, "U rGyan pa Rin chen dpal (1230-1309), Part Two", p. 338 (see also p. 326f.). c.) The readings of the commentary may be useful to evaluate the AS_t readings as BCOM LDAN RIG RAL was an important figure in the production of the Tibetan Buddhist canon. See DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 82. d.) DAR MA RGYAL MTSHAN is according to MARTIN (*Tibskrit*, s.v. Bcom ldan Rig pa'i ral gri, 1227-1305), is another name for BCOM LDAN RIG RAL. See also the TBRC catalogue entry TBRC-W24700. e.) RIG RAL's extensive biography in DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG, ed., *dKar chag*, vol. 2, pp. 74-102 mentions only an outline (*sa bcad*) of the AS. According to the same source (p. 96), that outline is called *Kun gzhi rgyan gyi me tog*.

DPANG LO TSĀ BA BLO GROS BRTAN PA (1276-1342).[419]

• Title: "Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i rgya cher 'grel pa shes bya'i gsal byed" (abbr. AS-dPang-lo)

• Publication details: In id. 1999. *The Collected Works of Dpang-lo-blo-gros-brtan-pa*. [Kathmandu]: Sa skya rgyal yongs gsung rab slob gnyer khang, fols. 1a-272a.

• Section on *karman*: fols. 219b6-250b1.

• Notes: The available edition of DPANG LO's commentary contains some secondary notes

---

419 On DPANG LO TSĀ BA (TBRC-P 2085), see VERHAGEN, *Sanskrit Grammatical Literature*, vol. 1, pp. 88-90, DIEMBERGER, et al., *Feast of Miracles*, pp. 21-23, NGAG DBANG SKAL LDAN RGYA MTSHO, *History of the "White Crystal"*, pp. 62-70, 'DAR STOD DGRA 'DUL BANG PO, "Rig gnas lnga ji ltar byung ba'i tshul", pp. 299-303., MANG THOS KLU SGRUB RGYA MTSHO, "bsTan brtsis gsal ba'i nyin byed", p. 172f., 'GOS LO TSĀ BA, *Blue Annals*, vol. *tha*, fol. 15b2-16a4 (ROERICH, *Blue Annals: Part II*, pp. 785-787), KHANG DKAR, "Abidaruma-shūron", pp. 401-403, and DIMITROV, *Śabdālaṃkāradoṣavibhāga*, pp. 73-79.

(*mchan*) inserted within the main text. I consulted Professor KHANG DKAR on that issue, who told me that the origin of those notes is not clear. It seems that they are a later addition, not written by DPANG LO himself. On AS-dPang-lo, see also KHANG DKAR TSHUL KHRIMS SKAL BZANG, "*Abidaruma-shūron*".

THAR PA LO TSĀ BA NYI MA RGYAL MTSHAN (late 13th to early 14th c.)

• Title: *Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i de kho na nyid 'byung ba* (abbr. AS-Thar-lo)

• Publication details: In DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG, ed., *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 43, pp. 11-556.

• Section on *karman*: pp. 353,2-394,5.

• Notes: a.) The edition by the DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG (in *dbu med*) is preceded by a table of contents prepared by the editors. b.) I gained access to this most important commentary in the final stages of this publication only, wherefore I could not evaluate its doctrinal content. On THAR PA LO TSĀ BA, see my introduction.

BU STON RIN CHEN GRUB (1290-1364).

• Title: "Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i rnam bshad nyi ma'i 'od zer" (abbr. AS-Bu-ston)

• Publication details: In id. 1965-1971. *The Collected Works of Bu ston*, vol. 20. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, pp. 79-747.

• Section on *karman*: pp. 515,4-563,2-3.

'JAM DBYANGS BLO GROS (1291-1376)

• Title: "Dam pa'i chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i 'grel pa shes bya rab gsal snang ba" (abbr. AS-'Jam-dbyangs).

• Publication details: In id. 1977. *mNgon pa kun btus kyi 'grel pa*. Gangtok: Gonpo Tseten.

• Notes: The famous Jo-nang-pa scholar the identity of Sa bzang Ma ti Paṇ chen Blo gros rgyal mtshan (TBRC-P 151) cannot be ascertained without reservations.[420] The annals of the Jo-nang-pa school contain only a brief biography of his, which does not mention a commentary on the AS.[421] On SA BZANG's interpretation of effortlessness (*anābhoga*), see my notes ad ASBh 74,1-3.

RED MDA' BA GZHON NU BLO GROS (1349-1412).

• Title: "Dam pa'i chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i snying po legs bshad nor bu'i phreng ba" (abbr. AS-Red-mda')

---

[420] See VERHAGEN, *Sanskrit Grammatical Literature*, vol. 1, p. 142f. On Sa bzang's dates, see *op.cit.*, vol. 2, p. 413. On SA BZANG as a Sanskrit and Abhidharma scholar, see also 'JIGS BRAL YE SHES RDO RJE, *Nyingma School*, vol. II, p. 61, n. 834 and p. 520. See also STEARNS, *The Buddha from Dolpo*, pp. 21, 57, and RUEGG, "The Jo naṅ pas", p. 81, n. 37.

[421] NGAG DBANG BLO GROS GRAGS PA, *Jo nang pa'i chos 'byung*, p. 33f.

• Publication details: In id., *Red mda' ba gzhon nu blo gros kyi gsung skor*, vol. 2 (*kha*). Mussoorie: Sakya College, pp. 1-86.

• Section on *karman*: Pp. 39,1-43,1

A Commentary by LO CHEN GRAGS PA RGYAL MTSHAN (1352-1405)?

• Title: **mNgon pa kun btus kyi mdo tshig bsdus pa*

• Notes: This text is mentioned among the works of Lo chen Grags pa rgyal mtshan in NGAG DBANG SKAL LDAN RGYA MTSHO, *History of the "White Crystal"* (p. 74).[422] Lo chen Grags pa rgyal mtshan was a teacher of Bo dong PaṆ chen (on whom see below). From his biography it seems that he cooperated with Red mda' ba to some extent in writing commentaries.[423] Together with Red mda' ba, he gave the Bhikṣu ordination to Bo dong PaṆ chen at Shel dkar.[424] I think it therefore possible that the "*mngon pa kun btus kyi mdo tshig bsdus pa*" is actually identical with the verse summary (AS-Bo-dong-Verse) contained in Bo dong PaṆ chen's collected works, and that it is the joint production of the Lo chen, Bo dong PaṆ chen and maybe even Red mda' ba.

RGYAL TSHAB DAR MA RIN CHEN (1364-1432).

• Title: "Dam pa'i chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i rnam bshad legs par bshad pa chos mngon rgya mtsho'i snying po" (abbr. AS-rGyal-tshab)

• Publication details: In id. 1982. *rGyal tshab rje'i gsung 'bum*, vol. 3 (*ga*). sKu 'bum: sKu 'bum byams pa gling par khang, pp. 459-929 (fols. 1a-236b).

• Section on *karman*: Pp. 746,4-772,2 (fols. 144b-158a)

• Notes: a.) rGyal tshab's commentary is for the most part not more than a readable rephrasing of ASVy$_t$. b.) For my work on the commentary, I use the scans provided by the TBRC, of the print from sKu 'bum byams pa gling 1982 (TBRC-W23692). c.) The outline (*sa bcad*) followed by RGYAL TSHAB RJE is listed up in Tōyō Bunko Chibetto Kenkyūshitsu, *Sa bcad of rJe yab sras gsung 'bum*, pp. 111-162.

BO DONG PAṆ CHEN PHYOGS LAS RNAM RGYAL (1375-1450)

• Title: "sLob dpon 'phags pa thogs med kyis mdzad pa'i chos mngon pa kun las btus pa" (abbr. AS-Bo-dong-Verse)

• Publication details: In id., *Encyclopedia Tibetica: the Collected Works of Bo-doṅ Paṇ-chen Phyogs-las-rnam-rgyal*, vol. 16 (*ta*). New Delhi: Tibet House Library publications, pp. 1-122.

---

[422] On LO CHEN GRAGS PA RGYAL MTSHAN, see also my notes on YAR KLUNGS GRAGS PA RGYAL MTSHAN, above.

[423] "When the great translator was in Shel dkar, the master (*rje btsun*) RED MDA' BA was residing there, too, and therefore (*nas*) he performed great deeds in teaching, debating and writing." My own, slightly altered, translation. See NGAG DBANG SKAL LDAN RGYA MTSHO, *History of the "White Crystal"*, p. 75.

[424] See NGAG DBANG SKAL LDAN RGYA MTSHO, *History of the "White Crystal"*, p. 77.

• Section on *karman*: Pp. 76,5-84,2

• Notes: a.) An outline of the AS in verse. b.) The title presented above is taken from the title leaf (p. 1). The colophon states: *chos mngon pa kun las btus pa slob dpon 'phags pa thogs med kyis mdzad pa'o* (p. 121).

• Title: "mNgon pa kun las btus pa de nyid bshad pa" (abbr. AS-Bo-dong-bShad)

• Publication details: In id., *Encyclopedia Tibetica: the Collected Works of Bo-doṅ Paṇ-chen Phyogs-las-rnam-rgyal*, vol. 16 (*ta*). New Delhi: Tibet House Library publications, pp. 123-803.

• Section on *karman*: Pp. 584,3-634,1

• Notes: a.) The front matter of vol. 16 contains an outline (in Tibetan) of the whole AS on four pages (pp. 3-6). There, the *karman* section is summarized in four lines (p. 5). b.) The orthography of the *Encylopedia Tibetica* is often corrupt. c.) BO DONG reached some fame as a Sanskrit scholar and he is said to have written some commentaries using Sanskrit originals for his research.[425] I consider it possible that BO DONG actually has access to the AS or ASBh in Sanskrit at some point, but I did not find any evidence in his AS commentaries. His biography mentions no Sanskrit texts in the context of his study and exposition of the AS.[426]

A Commentary by STAG TSHANG LO TSĀ BA SHES RAB RIN CHEN (1405-?)?

• Title: **mNgon pa kun btus kyi ṭīka.*

• Notes: Apart from the entry in the TBRC catalogue (TBRC-W731), I could not yet ascertain further details about this commentary. STAG TSHANG LO TSĀ BA (TBRC-P79) was, like RED MDA' BA and ŚĀ KYA MCHOG LDAN, an important Sa skya pa scholar .

ŚĀ KYA MCHOG LDAN (1428-1507)

• Title: "Dam pa'i chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i rnam par bshad pa rnal 'byor spyod gzhung rgya mtsho'i rlabs kyi phreng ba" (abbr. AS-Śāk)

• Publication details: In id. 1975. *The Complete Works (*gsung 'bum*) of gSer mdog Paṇ chen Śākya mchog ldan*. Thimphu: Kunzang Tobgey, pp. 1-340.

• Section on karman: Pp. 210,4-217,2

BSOD NAMS GRAGS PA (1478-1554)

• Title: "Chos mngon pa kun btus kyi dka' ba'i gnad grol ba'i dka' 'grel mkhas pa'i yid 'phrog" (abbr. AS-bSod-grags)

• Publication Details: In *The Collected Works (*gsung 'bum*) of Paṇ chen bSod nams grags pa*. Mundgod: Drepung Loseling Library Society, 1985-1988, vol. 9 (*ta*), pp. 531-680.

• Section on karman: Fols. 37a3-40b3

---

425 DIEMBERGER, et. al, *Feast of Miracles*, p. 26.

426 See DIEMBERGER, et. al, *Feast of Miracles*, pp. 47, 49, and 51.

• Notes: This commentary from the dGe-lugs-pa tradition presents an intelligent, stylistically rather bold summary of the contents, at times rephrasing the main points in a typical debate-manual style (e.g. *las kyi kun 'byung yod de /* [...] *las gang zhe na* [...] *zhes sogs kyis spros te 'chad pa'i phyir*, fol. 37a3-4), and only frequently discussing controversial issues in detail (e.g. the results of mixed black and white *karman* at fols. 39b5-40b1: *kha cig* [...] */ rang lugs ni ...*).

'JU MI PHAM (1846-1912)

• Title: "mNgon pa kun btus kyi rnam grangs sna tshogs bshad pa" (abbr. AS-Mi-pham).

• Publication Details: In id. 1984-1993. *The Expanded Redaction of the Complete Works of 'Ju Mi-pham*, vol. 12, Paro: Lama Ngodrup and Sherab Drimey, pp. 401-510

• Section on *karman*: Pp. 456,2-465,6 (fols. 26b-37a).

• Notes: a.) This volume of the "Expanded Redaction" series is reproduced from the sDe dge dgon chen prints. The edition contains a double folio count, one in Tibetan numerals for the whole volume (in which AS-Mi-pham is on fols. 197a-252b), and one in Tibetan words for only the AS commentary (fols. 1a-55b). b.) This commentary contains the text of the AS, sometimes abbreviated or rephrased. Comments from the ASBh (equally modified) are included occasionally.

GZHAN PHAN CHOS KYI SNANG BA (1871-1927).

• Title: "Theg pa chen po'i chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i mchan 'grel nor bu'i me long" (abbr. AS-gZhan-dga')

• Publication details: In id. 1978. *gZhung chen bcu gsum gyi mchan 'grel: Commentaries Expanding the Texts of the Chief Indic Buddhist Shāstras in Their Tibetan Translations*, vol.4 (*nga*). Dehra Dun: D. G. Khochhen Tulku, pp. 323-733 (fols. 1a-207a).

• Section on *karman*: Fols. 108b1-122a4

• Notes: This commentary is one of a series of gloss commentaries (*mchan 'grel*) written by GZHAN PHAN CHOS KYI SNANG BA. It mostly consists of AS text with explanations from the ASBh (often abbreviated) interspersed in a smaller type, which is GZHAN PHAN CHOS KYI SNANG BA's typical commentarial style. The commentary was written in a mountain retreat belonging to sDe dge dgon chen, most probably in 1909 or 1910.[427]

A Commentary by DOL BA RGYA RINGS?

• Title: **mNgon pa kun las btus pa'i rnam bshad*

• Notes: This text is mentioned in mTsho sngon Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, ed., *Bod kyi bstan bcos khag cig*, p. 611. Apart from that, I could not find any information about the text or its author.

---

427 See my forthcoming biography of mKhan po gZhan dga'.

Chinese Commentaries

JI (基, 632-682)

• Title: 大乘阿毘達磨雜集論述記.

• Publication Details: In *Dainihon zokuzōkyō* (大日本續藏經), vol. 74. Kyoto: Zōkyō Shoin, 1905-1912, pp. 302-459.

• Section on *karman*: Pp. 411-420.

• Notes: After studying some of pages of this commentary, I became aware that my knowledge of Chinese commentarial literature is not sufficient to benefit from it.[428] I follow DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 269) in considering JI (基) the accurate name of this scholar, while KUI (窺) was probably his fellow student under XUANZANG, so that *KUIJI (窺基) is wrong.[429] For more details on JI, see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 251.

A Commentary by XUANFAN (玄範)?

• Title: 大乘阿毘達磨雜集論疏

• Publication Details: 16 vols.

• Notes: Although this text is mentioned as the only extant work of XUANFAN in MOCHIZUKI, *Bukkyō daijiten* (s.v. 玄範), I was not able to locate it. Among XUANFAN's lost works, a 對法論疏 in ten volumes is also mentioned (*ibid.*). 對法論 (**Abhidharmaśāstra*) is another appellation for the AS or ASVy (see also below). Also LÜ CHENG (Enc.Bud., s.v. *Abhidharmasamuccaya*) mentions an available commentary on the AS by XUANFAN in 10 fascicles.

Lost Chinese Commentaries

A Japanese catalogue of classical Buddhist texts (諸阿闍梨真言密教部類總録, T 2176) mentions three commentaries on the AS (對法論): one by JI in seven volumes (對法論鈔七卷 基述), one by XUANFAN in ten volumes (對法論疏十卷 玄範述), and one by LINGJUN in sixteen volumes (對法論疏十六卷 靈俊述). I could not find any further details on LINGJUN's commentary.

LÜ CHENG (Enc.Bud., s.v. *Abhidharmasamuccaya*) lists LINGJUN's commentary in 16 fascicles, *Chih-jen's commentary in 5 fascicles, *Shêng-chuang's commentary in 12 fascicles, *Yüan-hsiao's commentary in 5 fascicles, and *Tai-hsien's *Record of Ancient Traces* in 5 fascicles, which are now lost.

---

428 Guiseppe TUCCI ("Buddhist Logic before Diṅnāga", p. 453) highly recommended JI's commentaries, but he had no access to the AS commentary.

429 See also SCHMITHAUSEN, *External World*, p. 17, n. 21.

Further Textual Witnesses

SGAM PO PA's *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*

Although SGAM PO PA's well-known *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan* (an early *bstan rim* treatise) often quotes the AS and the ASBh, those works are not always indicated as the source. Dealing with the Ten Kinds of Control (*vaśitā*), for example, the wording of the *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan* (p. 21f.) is almost completely identical with ASBh 73,14-25, although the latter is not explicitly referred to. I have compared the respective sections in the notes to the edition and translation.

MCHIMS 'JAM PA'I DBYANGS's *Chos mngon mdzod kyi tshig le'ur byas pa'i 'grel pa mngon pa'i rgyan*

The *mNgon pa'i rgyan* (also known as *mChims mdzod*) frequently refers to the AS by means of quotations. The evaluation of those has to be postponed to a later study.

Aim and Method of Edition and Translation

Aim

Edition and translation are meant to make the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* more accessible and understandable to other researchers, which necessitates firstly an 'emic'[430] approach, an attempt to clarify which implications the words of the text had at the time the author(s) wrote them down. From my reading of primary and secondary literature, I gained the conviction that an accurate understanding of the primary materials should precede their interpretation from an 'etic' perspective.

That is not to say that a philological approach is to any degree superior to a philosophical, comparative, or ethnological approach. Scrutinizing the texts in minute detail certainly limits the range of sources that can be covered. I therefore had to limit my research on the theoretical and *prescriptive* aspects of *karman* doctrine.[431] Bertrand RUSSELL jokingly remarked that "we have, in fact, two kinds of morality side by side; one which we preach but do not practice, and another which we practice but seldom preach", and a *description* of the latter, ethics as they are reflected in actual every-day behaviour, must primarily rely on historical documents, archaeological findings, ethnological observations and analogies in other religions and only then take the normative doctrine into account.[432] For the latter task, I hope to have made a contribution here.

Method

The text we know as "*Abhidharmasamuccaya*" as such is not a monolithic as it may appear at first sight. What I analyze here is its "classical form", that is, the text the

---

[430] See SCHMITHAUSEN, *External World*, p. 11.

[431] See also the remarks in SCHMITHAUSEN, "Buddhismus und Natur", p. 100 for a similar approach.

[432] See, e.g., the sources employed in SCHMITHAUSEN, *Buddhism and Nature*, pp. 8-12.

Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya and the *Abhidharmasamuccayavyākhyā* comment upon, or what roughly conforms to the MS edited by GOKHALE, and what formed the basis of the Chinese and Tibetan translations.[433] With looking at the text with an historian's eye, the structure of the whole work and other details possibly hint at a gradual enlargement of the text. The Lakṣaṇasamuccaya may well have been taught to students before the Satyaviniścaya or Sāṃkathyaviniścaya were accomplished, and so on.[434] The approximate reconstruction of the Sanskrit text is thus an attempt to restore the wording of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* in its classical form as I have defined it above.[435] Still, the reconstruction can only be approximate. There are many cases where neither the syntax nor the wording of the Sanskrit original can be restored without question, let alone the handling of the *sandhi*. Neither the Tibetan nor the Chinese translation alone forms the basis of my English translation, but rather what can be inferred from the available textual witnesses in combination. It is therefore fair to the reader and a better base for evaluation if the translation is not only presented along with the available Chinese and Tibetan versions, but also with the constructed Sanskrit text which is otherwise "hidden" in the mind of the translator.[436] It is that same principle which underlies my statements of hypotheses and speculations or my usage of drastic or even simplistic language: I think it is often productive to have a discourse about plainly stated models or assumptions, even if the situation is ambiguous. I therefore ask the reader's patience with repetitions or simplistic phrasing since those are made for the sake of a constructive discourse.

As PRADHAN's "retranslation" is often used as the standard source for references to the AS, I did not invent my own pagination or numbering. Reference to my approximate reconstruction can be made by means of the corresponding page and line numbers in PRADHAN's edition (e.g. "AS_{Bayer} 55,12" or the like). In the critical apparatus, I do not refer to PRADHAN's retranslation, which would mostly be pointless.

In my analysis I occasionally deviate from philological method and use a more

---

[433] At least for the *karman* section, the recensions of the "classical form" of the AS that were used as a basis for the ASBh, ASVy, AS_t and AS_c must have been quite identical. They contain not much more differences than orthographical ones, or typical scribal errors.

[434] About European textual traditions, RITTER (*Oxford Manual of Style*, p. 464) states that "there is just enough evidence to show that authors revised their texts after first copying, but not enough for us to do anything about it." HAKAMAYA ("Dharmaviniścaya Chapter", see my notes above) points to an ASBh sentence which was possibly added to the AS. Because such additions are not many, it is, I think, quite probable that the sentence was phrased by the AS author who added it to his own text, while it found its way into the lecture notes of a student and later into the ASBh. As for the *karma* section, its Tibetan and Chinese translations rarely hint at "non-classical" additions to the Sanskrit text.

[435] See MAAS, *Textkritik*, p. 5: "Aufgabe der Textkritik ist Herstellung eines dem Autograph (Original) möglichst nahekommenden Textes (constitutio textus)." Which is not to say that late Professor MAAS would have necessarily agreed with such a far-reaching reconstruction as mine.

[436] MAAS (*Textkritik*, p. 13) concedes a certain unavoidable degree of uncertainty for critical editions: "Wer sich fürchtet, einen unsicheren Text zu geben, wird besser tun, sich nur mit Autographa zu beschäftigen."

comparative approach to language when I analyse Buddhist Sanskrit terminology in comparison to similar expressions in other languages. An example is to be found in my notes ad ASBh 74,1-3, where I compare Skt. *ava-/gam* to Engl. *understand*, i.e. a word that is etymologically unrelated. I use this as an additional tool of analysis where neither traditional definitions and contexts nor modern lexicography provide satisfactory information. I find it necessary to discuss this approach here as much of the pioneering assessment of Buddhism was done by researchers inspired by the thought of Helena BLAVATSKY, C.G. JUNG, and/or Martin HEIDEGGER. That brought along a kind interpretative etymology and a liberal use of quotation marks which I normally object to, both for factual and aesthetic reasons. Still, I proceed on the assumption that all languages were initially formed to express something that was already in the brains of early humans *before* the invention of language, that is images, sounds, movements, etc., viz. the five sense-objects (the most fundamental hieroglyphs show, of course, images) with the wish to alarm, impress, or summon. For example, the experience of waking up from sleep was made even by our animal ancestors long before the formation of the word *buddha*. The names of simple naturalia such as *kāka* (crow) or *pada* (footprint) are already metaphorical to some extent. Up to the present day our brains work in a way where images, sounds, feelings etc. are primary while words are secondary, or, in other words, articulation is an art. A comparison of *ava-/gam* to *understand* thus leads to the conclusion that both denote movements or body postures (rather than sounds or images), which can be helpful for comprehending expressions such as Tib. *khong du chud pa* ("understood", more literally "entered into"). Nonetheless, I do not employ such associative etymologies as a stylistic device to intensify (in-tens-ify, so to speak) the emotional impact of my own writing.

In the annotated bibliography, I review some previous writings on the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*. Even though my remarks are partly off-track as far as *karman* is concerned, I found it worthwhile to present a new perspective on those writings. Books are normally reviewed only rather shortly after their publication, and many single articles never receive an appropriate evaluation.

Sanskrit: Editorial Principles

The occurrence or non-occurrence of *daṇḍa*s and *anusvāra*s is only indicated when my rendering deviates from that of both TATIA and the MS. In the same way, double *daṇḍa* is supplied without notice, normally following TATIA. The MS often supplies a *daṇḍa* after a *pratīka* that stands in the beginning of a sentence. As a rule, I follow TATIA who has omitted those *daṇḍa*s and eventually applied the respective *sandhi* rules.

TATIA (1950, *ASBh*, p. xxvi) has changed certain scribal peculiarities (like double consonant after *r*, e.g. *vitarkka* → *vitarka*) into Pāṇinean standard. I follow this standardization.[437] Consequently, certain scribal peculiarities remain unnoticed in my

---

[437] In the notes, I occasionally refer to AS sections which are preserved in the AS_{MS}. Due to time limitations, I could not verify all readings in the MS itself, mostly relying on use GOKHALE's edition. In such cases, the standardization is GOKHALE's, not mine.

edition:

- *paṃca* for *pañca*
- *skandhāṃ* for *skandhān*
- °*āṃ ca* for °*āñ ca*
- *anusvāra* before *daṇḍa*
- *m* instead of *anusvāra* before *v*
- *anusvāra* instead of *n*: *kampayaṃti*, *utpataṃti*
- double *m* after *r*: *karmma*
- omission of sandhi between final *ā* and initial *a*

Tibetan: Editorial Principles

The edition of the Tibetan materials does not aim at reconstructing the original translation orthographically, for this would imply the insertion of archaisms such as *da drag* and others without having much certainty about the original version as a whole. I therefore follow what I consider the most accurate print (Peking), but insert readings from other editions if they seem more accurate. An emendation against all available versions is applied only in cases where the entire AS_t or $ASBh_t$ transmission seems corrupt and another reading is to be expected in the original translation. On the other hand, I do not correct mistakes that seem to go back to the original translators, but only comment upon them in the notes.

As for punctuation, I have generally followed the Peking edition's use of the *shad*, without mentioning variants in the other editions. At times, I have inserted or omitted a *shad* without notice. An exception to this is made in cases of alternative readings where the *shad* makes a syntactical difference that explains the alternative reading, for example, $ASBh_{t,P}$ reads *sbyin pa ni* where reads $ASBh_{t,D}$ *sbyin pa /*. Here, the *shad* and the particle *ni* fulfil almost the same function, they indicate the end of an expression from the AS that is to be explained.

A gap between two syllables in Wylie transcription usually indicates a *tsheg* in the block print. Still, often the *tsheg* is not visible, or, for technical reasons, one finds two or more *tsheg*s in a row. This remains unmentioned, except in cases where a gap or several *tsheg*s on the block print indicate the erasure of a significant glyph, be it for editorial or for physical reasons.

Concerning the morphology of Tibetan verbs, I usually follow the form found in the textual witnesses (preferably P) with no attempt to standardize them. In the case of the term *brdzun du smra ba*, the Peking edition uses both *brdzun* as well as *rdzun*. I was unable to decide upon a standard form for my edition. Among Tibetan scholars, the euphonic handling of the syllable *pa* against its writing *ba* was disputed.[438] I ignore the reading of all versions and, lacking a better alternative, as a rule follow JÄSCHKE,

---

[438] See REAT, *Divine Tree*, p. 36.

Tibetan-English Dictionary. JÄSCHKE's entries seem more descriptive (i.e., less prescriptive) than those of other dictionaries.[439]

In the case of missing vowel signs two cases have to be distinguished: 1) vowel sign (probably) missing due to editorial decision (e.g. *gtang* for *gtong*); 2) vowel sign missing due to technical defect (e.g. *'gra* for *'gro*, *yad* for *yod*). The latter case, which occurs often in the sNar thang prints, remains unmentioned. Examples are $ASBh_{t,N}$ 51a4, where the British-Library version reads *byed pa'i las* (with $ASBh_{t,PGDC}$), while the Kyoto-University version of $ASBh_{t,N}$ reads *byad pa'i las* (ad ASBh 63,11, *°kāritrakarma°*), or $ASBh_{t,N}$ 53b1: $ASBh_{t,PN(British\ Library)GDC}$ *yongs su ma shes* against $ASBh_{t,N(Kyoto\ University)}$ *yongs su ma shas* (ad ASBh 66,19-21, *aparijñāna°*).[440]

Chinese

The edition of The Chinese text is provided primarily to enable the reader to critically evaluate my provisional reconstruction. I relied on relatively modern typeset editions (Taishō, Zhonghua) exclusively and did not consult any MSS or blockprints. I fully agree with DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 132) in that Taishō *must* be compared to the Zhonghua edition for any critical edition,[441] and in so far, I hope, my edition surpasses those two, but it is not elaborate enough as to yield any new insights on the history of the textual transmission.

As a rule, I have copied the alternative readings from the Taishō edition and use the same symbols for the sake of simplicity: 石 for Ishiyama MSS, an so on. A key to those symbols can be found in the introductory matter to every volume of the hardbound Taishō edition. When I exceptionally refer to Zhonghua, I use the symbols of Zhonghua where, unfortunately, 石 means "Fangshan stone-carved canon". The main text is copied from the electronic CBETA text, a highly accurate rendering of Taishō.

I provide a full-stop (。) at the end of sentences, but deviations from the Taishō edition's, sometimes rather provisional, punctuation are not indicated.[442] The syntactical marks (返り点) are completely omitted. Wherever technically possible, the Chinese

---

[439] See also ZIMMERMANN, *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra*, pp. 164, 167, and DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 407f., n. 870.

[440] On the current state of the sNar thang blocks, see WANGCHUK, *Resolve*, p. 380, n. 7. I had the chance to visit sNar thang in 1993 at a point when the monastery was being rebuilt. Visiting a store of original printing blocks, I had the impression that most of the original blocks had been destroyed, and that many of the remaining blocks were badly damaged. As far as my beginner's Tibetan allowed me to understand the monks, they did not plan to use any of the old printing blocks for the new edition.

[441] See for example ad AS 55,19-22 (**etat saṃdhāyoktaṃ*): Taishō reads 依此業故... 說 (AS_c 679c6), while only Zhongua notes that the Fangshan stone-carved canon (石) reads 依此義故... 說. Although this seems to be the work of a later editor, it could be the original reading.

[442] A similar approach has been adopted by DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 218). On Chinese punctuation, see also ZIMMERMANN *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra*, pp. 218-220. Especially the punctuation of the Taishō edition it know to be at times rather arbitrary.

character is chosen in accordance with the printed Taishō edition, i.e. 邊, but not 辺, and so on.

The Arrangement of the Edition, Translation, and Notes

For various reasons, the layout of the edition and translation proved to be more complicated than in many comparable studies. Firstly, the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* itself is to be presented along with the respective comments for each section in the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*.[443] Secondly, the English translation unavoidably has to be presented next to the original text as this study is not planned to be published in two volumes. A presentation on opposite pages is hardly feasible, given that the critical apparatus must be included along with the edited main text. Therefore my English translation appears below the respective section of the original text.

Although leading scholars in the field warned me against the publication of yet another reconstruction, I found it quite feasible, mostly due to the kind guidance of Professor SCHMITHAUSEN, but also because much of the terminology and phrasing can be identified in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*, *Triṃśikābhāṣya*, *Mahāvyutpatti*, and so on. Still, reconstructing a Sanskrit text remains a risky enterprise and even in this section under research the reconstruction is often not more than tentative. Therefore I provide the Tibetan and Chinese versions for evaluation. Sanskrit text that appears in the respective ASBh explanations is set in bold. The layout having become so complex, it proved quite impossible to include notes other than the critical apparatus alongside the main text,[444] so the annotation is placed separately,[445] and equally, for the sake of readability, I abstained from placing further markers in the English text that would indicate the varying degrees of certainty underlying the reconstruction (e.g. where it is supported by AKBh parallels). I would be happy to see the reconstruction improved by future researchers, or even made redundant by the reappearance of a Sanskrit MS.

---

443 For a similar proceeding, see MATHES, *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, or KRITZER, *Rebirth and Causation*.

444 Such a layout was convincingly managed by ZIMMERMANN (*Tathāgatagarbhasūtra*).

445 For example, SCHMITHAUSEN (*Nirvāṇa-Abschnitt*, pp. 77-199) and ERB (*Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti*, pp. 105-204) chose to separate the notes from the text. See also Issai FUNAHASHI's impressive study *Gō no kenkyū* (pp. 210-373).

Sigla, Abbreviations and other Marks used in the Critical Edition

The usage of square and angle brackets varies in the Buddhological editions that are in use nowadays. The philological standard is to use angle brackets (‹›) to indicate conjectural additions (e.g. SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālavavijñāna*, p. 228 and AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 52).[446] I use square brackets, similar to TATIA's method in the ASBh edition, SAKUMA, *Index*, p. 2, and DELHEY, *Samāhitā Bhūmiḥ*, p. 120, which has the advantage that square brackets then basically function in the same way as in English.

°	omitted part of a word (i.e. °*bhava* instead of *anubhava*)
:	line break (if not indicated by page break numbers)
+	illegible graph
[ ]	conjectural addition
bold type	words from the AS that are quoted in the ASBh (Tatia's marking is ignored). They are marked equally in the editions of both AS and ASBh
italics	in the preliminary AS reconstruction: words that are rather uncertain
underline	words in the ASVy that can neither be found in the AS nor in the ASBh
dotted underline	words in AS_c that have no equivalent in AS_t words in $ASVy_c$ that have no equivalent in $ASVy_t$
double wavy underline	words in $ASBh_t$ that have no equivalent in the ASBh (Sanskrit)

[446] See also RITTER, ed., *Oxford Style Manual*, p. 200: "In the nineteenth century [ ] were used for editorial supplements (now ‹ ›), and they still are by modern linguists and other non-classicists; Russian scholars use ‹ › to indicate deletions, [ ] for editorial interventions". According to RITTER, ed. (*ibid.*), still other conventions are in use for papyri and (increasingly) for inscriptions, among them "‹ › = wrongly omitted in source, editorially supplied" and "[] = matter lost because writing surface lost or worn smooth, supplied editorially".

CRITICAL EDITION AND TRANSLATION

[AS 53,3-4] Two Kinds of Action[1]

[AS$_c$ 678c29-679a1] 云何煩惱增上所 生[2]諸業。謂若思業若 思已業。總名 業相。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 101a5-6] *las gang zhe na/ sems pa'i las dang/ bsams*[a] *pa'i las te/*[b] *las kyi*[c] *mtshan nyid mdor bsdus*[d] *pa'o//*

*karma katamat/ **cetanākarma cetayitvā** ca karma saṃkṣiptaṃ karmalakṣaṇam*[e]*//*

What[3] is action (*karman*)? It is the action that is intention (*cetanā*) and the action after having intended (*cetayitvā*).[4] [That is] the condensed definition of action.[5]

[AS 53,4-5] Five Kinds of Action

[AS$_c$ 679a1-2] 又有五種業。一取受業。 二作用業。三加行業。四轉變業。五證 得業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 101a6] *yang las rnam pa lnga ste/ dmigs pa'i las dang/ byed pa'i las dang/ rtsol ba'i las dang/ bsgyur*[f] *ba'i las dang/ 'thob pa'i las so//*

*api khalu pañcavidhaṃ karma/ **upalabdhikarma kāritrakarma vyavasāyakarma pariṇatikarma prāptikarma** ca/*

Moreover,[6] action is also of five kinds:[7] the action that is perception (*upalabdhikarman*), the action that is efficacy (*kāritrakarman*), the action that is determination (*vyavasāya-karman*), the action that is transformation (*pariṇatikarman*) and the action that is obtainment (*prāptikarman*).

---

[a] AS$_{t,DC}$ *bsams*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bsam*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bsam*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNGD}$ *te*; AS$_{t,C}$ *ta*.

[c] AS$_{t,DC}$ *kyi*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *kyis*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *mdor bsdus*; ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bsdus*.

[e] Or, for *saṃkṣiptaṃ karmalakṣaṇam* reconstruct *karmalakṣaṇasaṃkṣepaḥ*?

[f] AS$_{t,DC}$ *bsgyur*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *sgyur*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bsgyur*.

[ASBh 63,6-7] The Action That Is Perception

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57a1-2] *bam po lnga pa//*[a] *dmigs pa'i las zhes*[b] *bya ba ni mig*[c] *la sogs pa'i*[d] *ste/ gzugs la lta ba la sogs pa'o//*

[ASBh 63,6-7][e] ***upalabdhikarma***[f] *cakṣurādīnāṃ rūpa darśanādi/ upalabdhikarman*

The action that is perception[8] consists in the seeing of visible matter (*rūpa*) with the eye and so on.[9]

[ASBh 63,7-8] The Action That is Efficacy

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57a2-3] *byed pa'i las ni sa la sogs pa'i*[g] *ste/ rten pa*[h] *la sogs pa'o// yang na rang*[i] *gi*[j] *mtshan nyid*[10] *kyi*[k] *byed pa gang yin pa ste/ 'di lta ste/ gzugs kyi ni*[l] *gzugs su yod pa'o zhes bya ba la sogs pa lta bu'o//*

[ASBh 63,7-8] [§62(ii)] ***kāritrakarma*** *pṛthivyādīnāṃ dhāraṇādi yad vā yasya svalakṣaṇakṛtyam/ tadyathā rūpaṇā*[m] *rūpasyety evamādi/*

The action that is efficacy consists in the supporting[11] of the earth, and so on–or whatever is the function[12] that makes up the peculiar characteristic (*svalakṣaṇa*) of anything. For example, "[The peculiar characteristic] of matter (*rūpa*) is deformation (*rūpaṇā*)", and so on.[13]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bam po lnga pa//*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de la*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *zhes*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *shes*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *zhes*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *mig*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *dmig*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *mig*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[e] ASBh 63, n. 3: "T. chapter V."

[f] ASBh$_{T}$ *karma*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *karmā*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[h] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rten pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *rten pa*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *rten*.

[i] *rang*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rang*.

[j] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *gi*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *gis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gi*.

[k] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *kyi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *kyi*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *kyis*.

[l] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *kyi ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ni*.

[m] ASBh$_{MS}$ *rūpaṇā* corrected from *rūpāṇā*.

[ASBh 63,8-9] The Action That is Determination

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57a3] *rtsol ba'i las ni bsam pa sngon du btang*[a] *ba'i lus la sogs pa'i las so//*

[ASBh 63,8-9] [§62(iii)] ***vyavasāyakarmā****bhisaṃdhipūrvakaṃ*[b] *kāyādikarma/*

The action that is determination[14] is action of the body, and so on,[15] that is preceded by an aim.[16]

[ASBh 63,9] The Action That is Transformation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57a3-4] *bsgyur ba'i las ni gser mgar*[c] *la sogs pa'i*[d] *ste/ rgyan la sogs pa'o*[e]*//*

[ASBh 63,9] [§62(iv)] ***pariṇatikarma*** *suvarṇakārādīnām alaṃkārādi/*

The action that is transformation are the ornaments[17] and so on of the goldsmiths, etc.

[ASBh 63,9-10] The Action That is Obtainment[18]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57a4] *'thob pa'i las ni 'phags pa'i lam la sogs pa ste*[f] *mya ngan las 'das pa*[g] *'thob pa la sogs pa'o//*

[ASBh 63,9-10] [§62(v)] ***prāptikarmārya****mārgādīnāṃ nirvāṇādhigamādi//*

The action that is obtainment[19] consists in the attainment of *nirvāṇa*,[20] [as the effect] of the Noble Path and so on.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *btang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,NDC}$ *btang*; ASVy$_{t,PG}$ *gtang*.

[b] ASBh *vyavasāyakarmābhisaṃdhipūrvakaṃ*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *vyavasāyakarmā abhisa[ṃ?]dhipūrvakaṃ*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *mgar*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *'gar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *mgar*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'i las*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ *par bsgyur ba'o*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa ste/*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'i*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'i*.

[AS 53,5] The Five Kinds of Action in the Context of the *Karman* Doctrine

[AS$_c$ 679a2] 今此義中意多分別加行業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 101a6] *skabs 'dir ni*[a] *phal cher rtsol ba'i las su 'dod do//*

asmiṃs tv arthe yadbhūyasā vyavasāya-karmābhipretam//

In this context, however, the action that is determination is meant mainly.

[ASBh 63,10-11] The Five Kinds of Action in the Context of *Karman* Doctrine: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57a4-5] *skabs 'dir ni phal*[b] *cher rtsol ba'i las su 'dod do zhes bya ba ni 'thob pa dang/*[c] *byed pa'i las kyang yod pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 63,10-11] ***asmiṃs tv arthe yadbhūyasā***[d23] ***vyavasāyakarmā***[e] ***bhipretam*** *iti prāpti kāritra-karmaṇor api saṃbhavāt//*[f]

"In this context, however, the action that is determination is meant mainly."[21] [That has been stated] because the action that is obtainment and the action that is efficacy do occur [here] also.[22]

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *'dir ni*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *'dir*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,NGDC}$ *phal*; ASBh$_{t,P}$ *phar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *phal*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *pa dang/*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa dang*.

[d] *yadbhūyasā*; ASBh$_T$ ASBh$_{MS}$ *yadbhūyasyā*.

[e] ASBh$_{MS}$ *vyavasāyakarma* (= Sakuma, *Index*, p. 23); ASBh$_T$ *vyavasā karma*.

[f] ASBh$_T$ //; ASBh$_{MS}$ /.

[AS 53,6] Three Kinds of Intention

[AS$_{c}$ 679a4] 何等思業。謂福業非福業不動業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 101a7] *sems pa'i las*[a] *gang zhe na*[b]*/ sems mngon par 'du byed pa*[c] *yid kyi las te/ bsod*[d] *nams dang/ bsod nams ma yin pa dang/ mi g.yo ba'o//*

cetanākarma katamat/ cittābhisaṃskāro manaskarma/ puṇyam apuṇyam āniṃjyaṃ ca//

What is the action of intention (*cetanākarman*)? It is an action of the mind that is a thought impulse (*cittābhisaṃskāra*).[24] It is meritorious,[25] demeritorious, or [leading to] immovability.[26]

[AS 53,6-7] Three Kinds of "Action after Having Intended": Body, Speech and Mind

[AS$_{c}$ 679a5] 何等思已業。謂身業語業意業

[AS$_{t,P}$ 101a7-8] *bsams*[e] *pa'i las gang zhe na*[f]*/ lus kyi las dang/ ngag gi las dang/ yid kyi las so//*

cetayitvā karma katamat/ kāyakarma vākkarma manaskarma ca/

What is the "action after having intended"? It is bodily, verbal and mental[27] action.[28]

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'i las*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'i*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bsod*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de yang bsod*.

[e] AS$_{t,NGDC}$ *bsams*; AS$_{t,P}$ *bsam*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PDC}$ *bsam*.

[f] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[AS 53,7-8] Two Kinds of "Action after Having Intended": Wholesome and Unwholesome[29]

[AS$_c$ 679a6] 又此身語意三業。或善或不善。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 101a8] *lus kyi las dang/ ngag gi las dang/ yid kyi las de*[a] *yang dge ba dang mi dge ba'o*[b]*//*

Moreover, those actions of body, speech and mind are [either] wholesome (*kuśala*) or unwholesome (*akuśala*).[30]

tāni punaḥ ***kāyavāṅmanaskarmāṇi*** *kuśalāny akuśalāni ca/*

[AS 53,8-10] Ten Kinds of Unwholesome Action[31]

[AS$_c$ 679a6-8] 不善者即十不善業道。謂殺生不與取欲邪行虛誑語離間語麁惡語雜穢語貪欲瞋恚邪見。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 101a8-b1] *mi dge ba ni mi dge ba'i las kyi lam bcu ste/ 'di lta ste/ srog gcod pa dang/ ma byin par len pa dang/ 'dod pas*[c] *log par g.yem pa dang/ rdzun*[d] *du smra ba dang/ phra ma dang/ ngag rtsub mo*[e] *dang/ tshig kyal pa*[f] *dang/ brnab sems dang/ gnod sems dang/ log*[g] *par lta ba'o//*

Unwholesome [actions] are the ten unwholesome paths of action (*karmapatha*),[32] namely: killing, taking what has not been given, sexual misconduct,[33] lying, slander, harsh words, idle prattle, covetousness, harmful intent and wrong view.

akuśalāni daśākuśalāḥ karmapathāḥ/ tadyathā ***prāṇātipāto 'dattādānaṃ kāmamithyācāro mṛṣāvādaḥ paiśunyaṃ pāruṣyaṃ saṃbhinnapralāpo 'bhidhyā vyāpādo mithyādṛṣṭiś*** *ca/*

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *de*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PDC}$ *de la*.

[b] AS$_{t,DC}$ *dge ba dang mi dge ba'o*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *mi dge ba dang dge ba'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PDC}$ *dge ba dang mi dge ba'o*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pas*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *pa la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *pas*; ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *pa la*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *rdzun*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *brdzun*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PDC}$ *brdzun*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *ngag rtsub mo*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *tshig rtsub po*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PDC}$ *ngag rtsub po*.

[f] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *kyal pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *khyal ma*; ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *'khyal pa*.

[g] AS$_{t,PNGC}$ *log*; AS$_{t,D}$ *leg*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *log*.

[AS 53,10-13] Ten Kinds of Wholesome Action

[AS$_c$ 679a8-11]善者即十善業道。謂離殺生離不與取離欲邪行離虛誑語離離間語離麁惡語離雜穢語[34]無貪無瞋正見

[AS$_{t,P}$ 101b2] *dge ba ni dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam rnams te/ 'di lta ste/ srog gcod pa spong ba nas tshig kyal*[a] *pa'i bar du spong ba dang/ brnab sems med pa dang/ gnod sems med pa dang/ yang dag par*[b] *lta ba'o//*

kuśalāni daśa kuśalāḥ ***karmapathāḥ****/ tadyathā* ***prāṇātipātā****d viratir yāvad* ***saṃbhinnapralāpā****d viratir* ***anabhidhyāvyāpāda****ḥ samyagdṛṣṭiś ca//*

Wholesome are the ten wholesome paths of action, namely, abstaining from killing [etc.,] up to abstaining from idle prattle, as well as absence of covetousness, absence of harmful intent and right view.

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *kyal*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *khyal*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *'khyal*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PDC}$ *pa'i*.

[ASBh 63,12-14] The Ten Paths of Action Representative of *Karman*

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57a5-6] lus la sogs pa'i las la[a] *las kyi lam zhes bya ba ni mdo sde dang mthun par*[b] *ji ltar gtso bor*[c] *bstan par rig par bya ste*[d]*/ de la sbyor ba la sogs pa*[e] *yang lus la sogs pa'i las kyi nang du 'dus pa'i phyir ro// las kyi lam gsum dang bzhi dang gsum ni go rim*[f] *bzhin du lus dang ngag dang yid kyi las kyi mtshan nyid du rig par bya'o//*

[ASBh 63,12-14] [§63] ***kāyādikarma*** [g] ***karmapathā*** *iti*[h] *sūtrānusāreṇa yathāpradhānaṃ nirdeśo veditavyas* [i] *tatprayogādīnām api* [j] *kāyādikarmāntarbhāvāt/ trayaś catvāras trayaś ca karmapathā yathākramaṃ kāyavāṅmanaḥkarma-lakṣaṇā veditavyāḥ//*

That bodily action and so on are the paths of action [as taught in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*] is to be understood as an exposition following their importance, in accordance with the sūtras.[35] [This is] because the preparation and so on of those [ten paths of action] are [strictly speaking] contained in bodily action and so on, too.[36] The three, four and three paths of action are, in this order, to be understood as having bodily, vocal and mental action [respectively] as their characteristics.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PDC}$ *ni*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *sde dang mthun par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PDC}$ *sde'i rjes su 'brangs nas*.

[c] *gtso bor*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gtso bo*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PDC}$ *gtso bor*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bya ste*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PDC}$ *bya'o*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PDC}$ *pa la*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *rim*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *rims*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *rim*; ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *rims*.

[g] ASBh$_{T}$ *kāyādikarma*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *kāyadikarma*.

[h] ASBh$_{MS}$ graph between *karmapathā* and *ti* illegible.

[i] ASBh$_{MS}$ *veditavyas*; ASBh$_{T}$ *veditavyaḥ*.

[j] *tatprayogādīnām api*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *tatprayogādīnām itipi*; ASBh$_{T}$ *tatprayogādīnāpi*. Cf. Sakuma (*Index*, p. 23). ASBh 63, n. 4: "Ms. *mitipi* for *mapi*."

[AS 53,13-14] Five Aspects of the Ten Paths of Action[37]

[AS$_c$ 679a12-13] 又殺生等應以五門分別其相。謂事故。意樂故。方便故。煩惱故。究竟故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 101b2-3] *srog gcod pa la sogs pa rnams kyi mtshan nyid ni gzhi dang/ bsam pa dang/ sbyor ba dang/ nyon mongs pa dang/ zin par byas pas kyang rig par bya'o//*

prāṇātipātādīnāṃ *lakṣaṇaṃ* ***vastuta āśayataḥ prayogataḥ kleśato niṣṭhāgamanataś*** *cāpi veditavyam//*

The characteristics of killing and so on are also to be understood from [the viewpoints of] object (*vastu*), disposition (*āśaya*), preparation (*prayoga*), defilement (*kleśa*) and completion (*niṣṭhāgamana*).

[ASBh 63,14-15] First Aspect: Object of the Paths of Action[38]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57a6-7] *srog gcod pa la sogs pa'i gzhi ni sems can gyi grangs su gtogs pa dang/ sems can gyi*[a] *grangs su ma gtogs pa dang/*[b] *ji ltar mthun mthun du sbyar*[c] *te/ gang la brten nas srog gcod pa la sogs pa 'byung ba'o//*

[ASBh 63,14-15] ***prāṇātipā***[d] ***tādīnāṃ***[e] [§63(a)] ***vastu*** *sattvasaṃkhyātam asattvasaṃkhyātaṃ vā yathāyogaṃ yad adhiṣṭhāya prāṇātipātādayaḥ pravartante/*

For killing and so on, the object[39] is either what is considered a sentient being or what is not considered a sentient being–as appropriate–based on which killing and so on occur.

[ASBh 63,16] Second Aspect: Disposition of the Paths of Action

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57a7-8] *bsam pa ni gzhi de la der 'du shes pa'i bsam*[f] *pa dang/ las kyi lam de byed par 'dod pa'i bsam pa'o//*

[ASBh 63,16] [§63(b)] ***āśayas*** *tatra vastuni tat-saṃjñāśayas tatkarmapathakriyecchāśayaś ca/*

The disposition[40] is (a.) the disposition [that consists in] the apperception[41] of that object as that[42] and (b.) the disposition [that consists in] the wish to do that path of action.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,GDC}$ *sems can gyi*; ASBh$_{t,PN}$ *sems gyi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *sems can gyi*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *sems can*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *pa dang/*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa dang/*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *sbyar*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *sbyar ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PDC}$ *sbyar*.

[d] ASBh 63, n. 5: "Ms. *pa*."

[e] ASBh$_T$ *prāṇātipātādīnāṃ*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *prāṇātipatādīnāṃ*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bsam*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PDC}$ *sems*.

[ASBh 63,16-17] Third Aspect: Preparation for the Paths of Action

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57a8] *sbyor*[a] *ba ni de bya ba'i*[b] *phyir bdag gam gzhan gyis*[c] *lus dang ngag dang yid kyi rtsom pa'o*[d]*//*

[ASBh 63,16-17] [§63(c)] ***prayogas*** *tat*[ASBh$_{MS}$ 57b]*kriyāyai svayaṃ parair vā kāyavāṅmanobhir ārambhaḥ/*

The preparation is the beginning[43] with body, speech and mind–either by oneself or through others[44]–for the sake of that action.[45]

[ASBh 63,17-18] Fourth Aspect: Defilement of the Paths of Action

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57a8-b1] *nyon mongs pa ni 'dod chags dang zhe sdang dang gti mug*[e] *'dus pa dang so so ba*[f] *ji ltar mthun mthun du sbyar ro//*

[ASBh 63,17-18] [§63(d)] ***kleśo*** *lobhadveṣamohā yathāyogaṃ samastavyastāḥ/*

The defilement[46] is greed, hatred and delusion[47] –as appropriate[48] –either combined (*samasta*) or singly (*vyasta*).

[ASBh 63,18-19] Fifth Aspect: Completion of the Paths of Action

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57b1] *zin par byas pa ni sbyor ba de dang des de'i*[g] *dus sam phyis las de dang des*[h] *yongs su rdzogs pa'o////*[49]

[ASBh 63,18-19] [§63(e)] ***niṣṭhāgamanaṃ*** *tena tena prayogena tasya tasya karmaṇaḥ paripūraṇaṃ tatkālam ūrdhvakālaṃ vā/*

The completion is the fulfilment of this or that action by means of this or that preparation–either at that time or later.[50]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *sbyor*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *sbyor*; ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *sbyar*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bya ba'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PDC}$ *byed pa'i*.

[c] *gyis*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gyi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gyis*; ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *gyi*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *kyi rtsom pa'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *kyi rtsol ba'o*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *kyis rtsom pa'o*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *mug*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *mugs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *mug*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *so ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *so*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *de dang des de'i*; ASBh$_{t,D}$ *de dang de'i*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *da dang da'*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PGD}$ *de dang des de'i*.

[h] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *de dang des*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PGD}$ *de*.

[ASBh 63,19-22] The Five Aspects in the Case of Killing

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57b1-3] *de la srog gcod pa'i gzhi ni sems can no// bsam pa ni de la der 'du shes shing bsad pa'i bsam pa'o// sbyor ba ni gsad*[a] *par bsams pa'i mtshon cha la sogs pa'o// nyon mongs pa ni 'dod chags*[b] *la sogs pa'o// zin par byas pa ni sbyor ba des de ma thag tu'am phyis shi ba'o//*

[ASBh 63,19-22] *tatra* [§63(i)] ***prāṇātipātasya*** [§63(i,a)] ***vastu*** *sattvaḥ*[c]/ [§63(i,b)] ***āśayas*** *tatra tatsaṃjñino vadhābhiprāyaḥ/* [§63(i,c)] ***prayogo*** *vadhāya praharaṇādibhiḥ*[d] /[55] [§63(i,d)] ***kleśo*** *lobhādikaḥ/* [§63(i,e)] ***niṣṭhāgamanaṃ*** *tasya prāṇinas tena prayogeṇānantaraṃ paścād vā maraṇam/*

Here,[51] the object of killing is a sentient being.[52] The disposition consists in the intention (*abhiprāya*) to kill[53] [it] in a person who is aware of that [sentient being] as that (i.e. as a sentient being). The preparation is [carried out] by means of a weapon,[54] and so on, for the sake of killing. The defilement is greed, and so on. The completion is the dying (*maraṇa*) of that living being as the result of that preparation, either immediately or later.

[ASBh 63,22-23] Approach for Explaining the Other Paths of Action

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57b3] *ma byin par len pa la sogs pa'i gzhi dang zin par byas pa bshad par bya'o// lhag ma ni ji ltar mthun mthun du sbyar bar bya'o*[e]*//*

[ASBh 63,22-23] ***adattādānādīnāṃ vastu*** *ca* ***niṣṭhāgamanaṃ*** *ca*[f] *nirdekṣyāmaḥ/ śeṣaṃ yathāyogaṃ yojayitavyam*[g]/

We will specify the object and completion of taking what has not been given and the remaining [eight unwholesome actions]. The rest [of the five aspects] have to be applied as appropriate.

[a] *gsad*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bsad*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gsad*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'dod chags*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *chags pa*.

[c] ASBh 63, n. 6: "Ch. *sattvasaṃkhyātam*."

[d] *vadhāya praharaṇādibhiḥ*; ASBh$_{MS,T}$ *vadho yat praharaṇādibhiḥ*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *sbyar bar bya'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *sbyar ro*.

[f] ASBh$_{MS}$ illegible graph after *ca*.

[g] ASBh$_{T}$ *yojayitavyam*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *yojayitavyaṃ*.

[ASBh 63,23-25] Aspects of Taking What has not Been Given

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57b3-4] *ma byin par len pa'i gzhi ni gzhan*[a] *gyis yongs su gzung ba sems can gyi grangs su gtogs pa'am*[b] *sems can gyi grangs su ma gtogs pa'o// zin par byas pa ni bdag gir byas pa'o//*

[ASBh 63,23-25] [§63(ii)] ***adattādāna**sya* ***vastu*** *paraparigṛhītaṃ sattvasaṃkhyātam asattva-saṃkhyātaṃ vā/* ***niṣṭhāgamanaṃ*** *tatsvīkaraṇaṃ/*

The object of taking what has not been given is [something] owned by another, that is [either] considered a sentient being or not considered a sentient being. The completion is making that one's own.

[ASBh 63,25-26] Aspects of Sexual Misconduct[56]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57b4-6] *'dod pa la*[c] *log par g.yem pa'i gzhi ni spyod yul ma yin pa'i bud med dang/ spyod yul yin yang yan lag ma yin pa dang/ yul ma yin pa dang/ dus ma yin pa dang/ tshod ma zin*[d] *pa dang/ rigs ma yin pa dang/ pho dang ma ning thams cad do// zin par byas pa ni gnyis kyis gnyis sprad*[e] *pa'o//*

[ASBh 63,25-26] [§63(iii)] ***kāmamithyācāra**sya* ***vastv***[f] *agamyā strī gamyā vānaṅgādeśākāleṣv amātrāyuktābhyāṃ ca sarvaś ca pumān napuṃsakaṃ ca/* ***niṣṭhāgamanaṃ*** *dvayadvaya-samāpattiḥ//*[f]

The object of sexual misconduct is a women not to be approached;[57] or [a woman] to be approached, [but] with the wrong part of her body,[58] at the wrong place[59] or at the wrong time,[60] excessively[61] [or] inappropriately;[62] or every male[63] or hermaphrodite.[64] The completion is the copulation.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *gzhan*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *bzhan*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gzhan*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'am*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa dang*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *pa la*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *pas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa la*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *zin*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *sprad*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *sprad*; ASVy$_{t,C}$ *sprod*.

[f] ASBh$_{T}$ *vastv*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *vastu*.

[ASBh 63,27-64,1] Aspects of Lying[65]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57b6-7] *brdzun du smra ba'i gzhi ni/ mthong ba dang/ thos pa dang/ bye brag phyed pa dang/ rnam par shes pa dang/ ma mthong ba dang/ ma thos pa dang/ bye brag ma*[a] *phyed pa dang/ rnam par ma shes pa'o// bsam pa ni gzhan du 'du shes la gzhan du smra bar 'dod pa'o// zin par byas pa ni 'khor dang phyir rgol bas*[b] *go bar byed pa'o//*

[ASBh 63,27-64,1] [§63(iv)] ***mṛṣāvādasya*** ***vastu*** *dṛṣṭaṃ śrutaṃ mataṃ vijñātam adṛṣṭam aśrutam amatam avijñātaṃ ca/* ***āśayo*** *'nyathā [saṃjñino nyathā]vaktukāmatā*[c]*/*[69] ***niṣṭhāgamanaṃ*** *parṣat-prativādivijñāpanam/*

The object of lying is [something] seen, heard, thought, known,[66] or something not seen, heard, thought, or known.[67] The disposition is that someone who knows that it is (/was) [actually] different desires to say that it is (/was) different. The completion is making it known to the assembly and to the opponent.[68]

[ASBh 64,2-3] Aspects of Slander

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57b7-8] *phra ma'i gzhi ni sems can 'dum pa dang/ mi 'dum pa dag go// bsam pa ni dbye ba dang sdum*[d] *mi bya bar*[e] *sems pa'o// zin par byas pa ni phye*[f] *bar shes par byed pa'o//*

[ASBh 64,2-3] [§63(v)] ***paiśunyasya vastu*** *samagravyagrāḥ sattvāḥ/* ***āśayas*** *teṣām eva bhedāpratisaṃdhānābhiprāyaḥ/* ***niṣṭhāga-*** [ASBh$_{MS}$ 58a]***manaṃ*** *bhedyavijñā*[g]*panam*[h]*/*

The object[70] of slander[71] consists in beings who are either united or disunited.[72] The disposition consists in the intention (*abhiprāya*) [to bring about] a split or a a non-unification[73] among those [respectively]. The completion is making known [to them something] divisive.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *ma*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *mi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ma*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba la*.

[c] *'nyathā[saṃjñino anyathā]vaktukāmatā*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *[a]nyathāvaktukāmatā* (= Sakuma, *Index*, p. 23); ASBh$_T$ *[a]nyathāvatkukāmatā*. ASBh 64, n. 1: "T. & Ch. *anyathāsaṃjñā 'nyathāvaktukāmatā*."

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *sdum*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bsdums*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *bya bar*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *byed par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bya bar*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *phye*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *che*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *phye*.

[g] ASBh 64, n. 2: "MS *jña*."

[h] ASBh$_T$ *bhedyavijñāpanam*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *bhedyavijñapanaṃ*.

[ASBh 64,3-4] Aspects of Harsh Words

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 57b8-58a1] *ngag rtsub po'i gzhi*[a] *ni kun nas mnar sems kyi gzhir*[b] *gyur pa'i*[c] *sems can rnams so// zin par byas pa ni ngag rtsub po*[d] *smras pa'o//*

[ASBh 64,3-4] [§63(vi)] ***pāruṣyasya***[e] [76] ***vastv*** *āghātanimittabhūtāḥ sattvāḥ/* ***niṣṭhāgamanaṃ*** *pāruṣyasya bhāṣaṇam*[f]*/*

The object of harsh words [74] consists in beings that are the cause of [one's] anger. [75] The completion is saying the harsh words.

[ASBh 64,4-5] Aspects of Idle Prattle[77]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 58a1] *tshig bkyal*[g] *ba'i gzhi ni don med pa dang ldan*[h] *pa'i don no*[i]*// zin par byas pa ni de smras pa'o//*

[ASBh 64,4-5] [§63(vii)] ***saṃbhinnapralāpa****sya* ***vastv*** *anartho****pasaṃgṛhīto*** *'rthaḥ*[j] */* ***niṣṭhā-gamanaṃ*** *tasya bhāṣaṇam/*

The object of idle prattle[78] is a topic (*artha*) that is unrelated to something that has a purpose (*artha*). [79] The completion [consists in] saying it.[80]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gzhi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rgyu*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gzhir*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rgyur*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *po*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *po*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *mo*.

[e] ASBh$_{T}$ *pāruṣyasya*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *pāruṣasya*.

[f] *pāruṣyasya bhāṣaṇam*; ASBh$_{MS,T}$ *pāruṣāṇām*. Sakuma (*Index*, p. 24): *pāruṣyabhāṣaṇam*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *bkyal*; ASBh$_{t,D}$ *kyal*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *rkyal*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *khyal*; ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *'khyal*.

[h] ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *dang ldan* ; ASBh$_{t,N}$ (illegible). Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dang ldan*.

[i] ASBh$_{t,C}$ *no*; ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *to*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *no*; ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *to*.

[j] ASBh$_{T}$ *upasaṃgṛhītārthaḥ*; ASBh$_{MS}$ ***upasaṃgṛhīto*** *'rthaḥ* (corrected from *upasamgṛhītārthaḥ*?).

[ASBh 64,5-7] Aspects of Covetousness

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 58a1-2] *brnab sems kyi gzhi ni gzhan gyi nor dang yo byad do// bsam pa ni de la der 'du shes shing de bzhin du 'dod pa'o// sbyor ba ni de*[a] *bdag gir bya bar sems pa'o// zin par byas pa ni bdag gir bya bar*[b][81] *nges pa'o//*

[ASBh 64,5-7] [§63(viii)] ***abhidhyāyā vastu*** *parakīyaṃ vittopakaraṇam/* ***āśayas*** *tatra tatsaṃjñinas tathāruciḥ/* ***prayogas*** *tatsvī-karaṇa*[cd][85]*saṃpradhāraṇam/*

niṣṭhāgamanaṃ *tatsvīkaraṇaniścayaḥ/*

The object of covetousness[82] consists in another's riches and commodities.[83] The disposition is the fondness [that a person] who regards that [object] as that (i.e. as belonging to someone else) [has towards the object] in that way. The preparation is the deliberation to make it one's own. The completion is the certainty[84] to make it one's own.

[ASBh 64,7-8] Aspects of Harmful Intent

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 58a2-3] *gnod sems kyi gzhi ni kun nas mnar sems kyi rgyur gyur pa'i sems can rnams so// zin par byas pa ni gsad*[e][86] *pa la sogs par nges pa'o//*

[ASBh 64,7-8] [§63(ix)] ***vyāpādasya vastv*** *āghātanimittabhūtāḥ sattvāḥ/* ***niṣṭhāgamanaṃ*** *prahananādiniścayaḥ*[f]*/*

The object of harmful intent[87] consists in beings that are the cause of [one's] anger. The completion is the certainty to slay them, and so on.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ni de*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ni*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bya bar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *byas par*.

[c] ASBh 64, n. 3 (for *āśayas ... svīkaraṇa*): "'*āśayaṃ ... svīkaraṇa*' is the bottom margin of MS."

[d] ASBh$_{T}$ *tatsvīkaraṇa*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *tatsvīkaraṇaṃ*. ASBh 64, n. 4: "MS *ṇaṃ*."

[e] *gsad*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bsad*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gsad*; ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *bsad*.

[f] Sakuma (*Index*, p. 24): *prahaṇanādiniścayaḥ*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *prahananādiniścayaḥ*; ASBh$_{T}$ *prahanananiścayaḥ*.

[ASBh 64,8-10] Aspects of Wrong View[88]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 58a3-4] *log par lta ba'i gzhi ni don yod pa'o// bsam pa*[a] *ni yod pa la*[b] *med par 'du shes shing de bzhin du 'dod pa'o// zin par byas pa ni skur ba 'debs par*[c] *nges pa'o//*

[ASBh 64,8-10] [§63(x)] ***mithyā dṛṣṭer vastu*** *sann arthaḥ/* ***āśayaḥ*** *saty atatsaṃjñina*[d]*s*[e] *tathāruciḥ/ niṣṭhāgamanam apavāda niścayaḥ//*

The object of wrong view is an existing thing (*artha*). The disposition is the fondness [that a person] who regards [something] existing as being not so (i.e. as non-existing) [89] [has when regarding it] in that way (i.e. as non-existing). The completion is the certainty to deny it.

[AS 53,15] Intentionality[90]

[AS$_c$ 679a14] 如契經言故思造業。云何名爲故思造業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 101b3-4] *sems pa las gyur pa'i las shes*[f] *gang byung*[g][92] *ba de la*[h]*/ sems pa las gyur pa gang zhe na*[i]*/*

yad uktaṃ saṃcetanīyaṃ karmeti/ tatra katamā saṃcetanīyatā/ (?)[93]

[In the sūtras] "intentional [91] action" has been mentioned. What is [that] intentionality (*saṃcetanīyatā*)?

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *pa*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *pas* (graph *sa* erased?). Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGC}$ *skur ba 'debs par*; ASBh$_{t,D}$ *skur 'debs par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *skur bar*.

[d] ASBh 64, n. 5: "Ms. inserts *tathā*."

[e] ASBh$_T$ *atatsaṃjñinas*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *atatsaṃjñinatathās*.

[f] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *shes*. AS$_{t,DC}$ *zhes*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *zhes*.

[g] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *byung*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *'byung*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bshad*.

[h] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *de la*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *la*.

[i] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[AS 53,15-17] Five Kinds of Intentionality

[AS$_{c}$ 679a14-17] 謂他所教勅[a]故思造業。他所勸請故思造業。無所了知故思造業。根本執著故思造業。顛倒分別故思造業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 101b4-5] *gzhan gyis*[b] *bsgo ba sems pa las gyur pa dang/ gzhan gyis gsol ba btab pa sems pa las gyur pa dang/ mi shes pa'i sems pa las gyur pa dang/ rtsa ba la mngon par zhen pa'i sems pa las gyur pa dang*[c]*/ phyin ci log gi sems pa las gyur pa'o//*

parājñaptisaṃcetanīyatā parasaṃjñaptisaṃcetanīyatāvijñāyasaṃcetanīyatā mūlābhiniveśasaṃcetanīyatā viparyāsasaṃcetanīyatā *ca/*

It is (1.) intentionality [due to] the command of others, (2.) intentionality [due to] the persuasion of others, (3.) intentionality without having understood, (4.) intentionality [due to] intense fixation [because of] the roots [of the unwholesome actions] and (5.) intentionality [due to] a mistake.

[ASBh 64,11-12] Intentionality Due to the Command of Others[94]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 58a4-5] *gzhan*[d] *gyis bsgo*[e] *ba sems pa las gyur pa ni 'di lta ste/ 'ga' zhig ni mi 'dod bzhin du gzhan dag gis nan gyis bsgos*[f] *nas bsams*[g] *te/ mi dge ba spyod pa'o//*

[ASBh 64,11-12] [§64(i)] ***parājñaptisaṃcetanīyatā*** *yathā kaścid anicchann api parair balād ājñāpyamano 'bhisaṃdhāyākuśalam ācarati/ parājñapti*

Intentionality [due to] the command of others is when someone, though unwilling, deliberately (*abhisaṃdhāya*)[95] does what is unwholesome when forcibly commanded by others.

---

[a] AS$_{c}$ 勅; AS$_{c}$ (CBETA ed.) 敕.

[b] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gyis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gyis*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gyi*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *dang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *dang*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gang*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gzhan*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de la gzhan*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *gyi bsgo*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *gyis bsgo*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gyis bsgo*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gyi sgo*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *nan gyis bsgos*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *nan gyis bsgo*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bsgo*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *bsams*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *bsam*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bsams*.

[ASBh 64,12-14] Intentionality Due to the Persuasion of Others

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 58a5-6] *gzhan*[a] *gyis gsol ba btab pa sems pa las gyur pa ni*[b] *'di lta ste/ 'ga' zhig mi 'dod bzhin du gzhan dag gis gsol ba btab nas/ 'di ni*[c] *phan pa'o// zhes yang dag par 'dzin du bcug cing len*[d] *du bcug nas bsams te mi dge ba spyod pa'o//*

[ASBh 64,12-14] [§64(ii)] ***parasaṃjñapti-saṃcetanīyatā*** *yathā kaścid a'nicchann eva*[e] [97] *paraiḥ saṃjñāpyamānaḥ samādāpyamāno hitam etad iti grāhyamāṇo*[f] *'bhisaṃdhāyā'kuśalam ācarati/*

Intentionality due to the persuasion of others is when someone, [although he is] equally unwilling, deliberately does what is unwholesome when persuaded and admonished[96] by others and made to believe "that is beneficial".

[ASBh 64,14-15] Intentionality Without Having Understood

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 58a6-7] *mi shes pa'i sems pa las gyur pa ni 'di lta ste/ kha cig yon tan dang nyes par*[g] [98] *mngon par mi shes shing/ mngon par zhen pa med pa la/*[h] *'dod dgar*[i] *bsams nas mi dge ba*[j] *spyod pa'o//*

Intentionality without having understood is when someone, spontaneously and deliberately, does what is unwholesome

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gzhan*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gzhan dag*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *pa ni*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *pa*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'di ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *'di ni*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *'di*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bcug cing len*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'jug len*.

[e] *eva*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *+va*; ASBh$_{T}$ *iva*.

[f] ASBh$_{T}$ *grāhyamāṇo*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *grāhyamāno*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *par* ; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[h] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *med pa la/*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *med la/*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *med par*.

[i] ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *dgar*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *dgur*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gar*.

[j] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bsams nas mi dge ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *bsams nas mi dge ba*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bsam gtan mi shes pa*.

[ASBh 64,14-15] [§64(iii)] ***avijñāya-saṃcetanīyatā***[a] *yathā kaścid guṇadoṣānabhijño 'nabhiniviṣṭaḥ yadṛcchayābhisaṃdhāyākuśalam ācarati/*

without knowing the virtues or faults [involved] and without being intensely fixated [on the action].

[ASBh 64,15-17] Intentionality Due to Intense Fixation [Because of] the Roots

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 58a7-8] *rtsa ba la mngon par zhen pa'i sems pa las gyur pa ni 'di lta ste// 'ga' zhig mi dge ba'i rtsa ba*[b] *chags pa la sogs pas zil gyis non cing sems non nas mngon par zhen*[c] *pa drag pos bsams te mi dge ba*[d] *spyod pa'o//*

[ASBh 64,15-17] [§64(iv)] ***mūlābhiniveśa-saṃcetanīyatā*** *yathā kaścid akuśalamūlaiḥ lobhādibhir abhibhūta āviṣṭacittas tīvreṇābhiniveśenābhisaṃdhāyākuśalam ā*[ASBh$_{MS}$ 58b]*carati/*

Intentionality due to intense fixation [99] [because of] the roots [100] is when someone who has been overwhelmed by the roots of the unwholesome [actions], such as greed and so on,[101] deliberately does what is unwholesome with a fixated mind and with a violent [102] intense fixation.

[ASBh 64,17-19] Intentionality Due to Mistake

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 58a8-b1] *phyin ci log gi*[e] *sems pa las gyur pa ni 'di lta ste// 'ga' zhig chos 'dod kyang mi mthun pa'i rgyu la lta ste// phyi ma la yid du 'ong ba'i*[f] *'bras bu'i don du bsams nas mi dge ba*[g] *spyod pa'o//*

[ASBh 64,17-19] [§64(v)] ***viparyāsa-saṃcetanīyatā*** *yathā kaścid dharmakāmo viṣamahetudṛṣṭir āyatyām iṣṭaphalārtham abhisaṃdhāyākuśalam ācarati/*

Intentionality due to a mistake is when someone who wishes what is righteous (*dharma*), [but] who has the wrong view of an unsuitable cause [for karmic results], [103] for the sake of a desired future [104] fruit (i.e. result)[105] deliberately does what is unwholesome.

---

[a] ASBh$_{MS}$ *avijñāyasaṃcetanīyatā*; ASBh$_{T}$ *avijñāya saṃcetanīyatā*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *ba*. ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *ba la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *zhen*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *shes*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *ba*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *ba la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba la*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *log gi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *log gi*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *log*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *'ong ba'i*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *'ongs pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'ong ba'i*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba la*.

[AS 53,17-19] The Last Two Kinds of Intentionality Heap Up *Karman*

[AS_c 679a17] 此中根本執著故思造業。顛倒分別故思造業。若作若增長非不受異熟。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 101b5-6] *de la rtsa ba la mngon par zhen pa'i sems pa las gyur pa dang/ phyin ci log gi sems pa las gyur pa'i las byas shing bsags pa'i rnam par smin pa ni*[a] *myong bar mi 'gyur ba ma yin no//*

tatra ***mūlābhiniveśasaṃcetanīyasya viparyāsa-saṃcetanīyasya*** *ca karmaṇaḥ* ***kṛta****syopacitasya* ***vipāko nāpratisaṃvedanīyaḥ****/ kṛta*

Here, [when] the *karman* of intentionality due to intense fixation on the roots and the *karman* of intentionality due to a mistake are done and heaped up,[106] their ripening[107] is not [something that is] not to be experienced [as a future unpleasant result].

[ASBh 64,19-20] Three Kinds of Intentionality do not Heap Up *Karman*[108]

[$ASBh_{t,P}$ 58a8-b1] *de la sems pa las gyur pa dang po*[b] *gsum ni las byas su*[c] *zin kyang sogs*[d] *pa nyid du mi 'gyur te/ de'i phyir 'di'i rnam par smin pa gdon mi za bar myong bar 'gyur*[e] *ba ma yin no//*

[ASBh 64,19-20] *tatra pūrvakābhis tisṛbhiḥ saṃcetanīyatābhiḥ* ***kṛtam*** *api karma naivopacīyate yato 'sya* ***nāvaśyaṃ vipākaḥ pratisaṃvedanīyaḥ****/*

Even if *karman* has been done through the first three intentionalities, it is surely not heaped up, so that its ripening is not necessarily to be experienced.

---

[a] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa ni*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[b] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *de la sems pa las gyur pa dang po*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *sngon ma*.

[c] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *byas su*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,P}$ *byas su*; $ASVy_{t,D}$ *byas*.

[d] $ASBh_{t,PNG}$ *sogs*; $ASBh_{t,DC}$ *stsogs*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,D}$ *sems pa las gyur pa'i las bsags*; $ASVy_{t,P}$ *sems pa las gyur pa'i lam bsags*.

[e] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *myong bar 'gyur*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *'gyur*.

[ASBh 64,20-21] Two Kinds of Intentionality Heap up *Karman*

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 58b1-2] *sems pa las 'gyur pa tha ma gnyis*[a] *ni gal te byas par gyur na bsags pa yin te/ de'i rnam par smin pa gdon mi za bar myong bar 'gyur ro//*

[ASBh 64,20-21] *paścimābhyāṃ tu saṃcetanīyatābhyāṃ yadi* ***kṛtaṃ*** *bhavaty* ***upacitaṃ*** *cāvaśyam evāsya* ***vipākaḥ*** *pratisaṃvedyate/*

But if [*karman*] is[109] done and heaped up through the latter two intentionalities, its ripening will just inevitably be experienced.

[AS 53,20] Definition of "Performing" and "Heaping up"[110]

[AS$_c$ 679a19] 作者。謂起造諸業令其現行。增長者。謂令習氣增益

[AS$_{t,P}$ 101b6] *las kyi*[b] *byed pa ni kun tu spyod*[c] *pa'o// bsags pa ni bag chags 'phel ba'o*[d]*//*

kriyā karmaṇaḥ samudācāraḥ/ ***upacayo vāsanāvṛddhiḥ****//*

The performing[111] of actions is doing [them]. Heaping up[112] is the increase[113] of the imprints.[114]

[ASBh 64,22] Further Explanation on "Heaping up"[115]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 58b2-3] *sogs*[e] *pa ni bag chags 'phel ba'o// zhes bya ba ni kun gzhi*[f] *rnam par shes pa la rnam par smin pa'i sa bon yongs su gsos*[g] *par rig par bya'o//*

"Heaping up is the increase of the imprints." That has to be understood as the nurturing of the

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa tha ma gnyis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'i las phyi ma dag*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *las kyi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *las*.

[c] AS$_{t,DC}$ *spyod*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *gcod*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *spyod*.

[d] AS$_{t,DC}$ *ba'o*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *lo*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba'o*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *sogs*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *stsogs*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *zhes bya ba ni kun gzhi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *kun tu len pa'i*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yongs su gsos*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gsos*.

[ASBh 64,22] ***upacayo vāsanāvṛddhir*** *ity ālayavijñāne vipākabīja* [a] *paripoṣaṇam* [b] *veditavyam//*

seeds for ripening (*vipākabīja*)[116] in the *ālayavijñāna*.[117]

[AS 54,1] *Karman* That is Certainly to be Experienced[118]

[AS$_c$ 679a21] 如契經言決定受業。云何名爲決定受業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 101b6-7] *myong bar nges pa'i las shes gang 'byung*[c] *ba de la*[d]*/ nges pa gang zhe na*[e]*/*

yad uktam[119] *niyatavedanīyaṃ karma iti/ tatra niyamaḥ katamaḥ/*

As for what has been said [in the sūtra] "*karman* that is certainly to be experienced": What is [that] "certainty"?

[AS 54,1-2] Three Kinds of Certainty

[AS$_c$ 679a21-22] 謂作業決定。受異熟決定。分位決定。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 101b7-8] *las byed par nges pa dang/ rnam par smin pa myong bar nges pa dang/ dus nges pa'o//*

karmakriyāniyamo vipākapratisaṃvedanāniyamo 'vasthāniyamaś *ca//*

[It is] (1.) the certainty of doing the action, (2.) the certainty of experiencing the ripening[120] and (3.) the certainty of time.

---

[a] ASBh 64, n. 6: "MS *jīva* for *bīja*."

[b] ASBh$_T$ *vipākabījaparipoṣaṇaṃ*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *vipākajīvaparipoṣaṇaṃ*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'byung*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bshad*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *de la*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *la*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[ASBh 64,23-26] First Certainty: Doing the Action[121]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 58b3-4] *las*[a] *byed par nges pa ni sngon gyi las rnams kyis*[b] *rnam par smin pa'i rgyud nges par byas nas 'phangs par gyur pa ste// gang tshe*[c] *de la 'dis las 'di*[d] *byed par de nges*[e] *pa*[f] *de dang mi 'gal*[g] *bar las de byed de/ rgyu'i*[h] *nges pa*[i] *ji lta ba bzhin du 'bras bu'i rgyun gyur*[j] [122] *pa'i phyir de mi bya bar bzlog pa*[k] *ni sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das rnams kyis kyang mdzad mi spyod*[l] *do//*

[ASBh 64,23-26] [§65(i)] ***karmakriyāniyamaḥ*** *pūrvakarmabhir evaṃ*[m] *niyamya vipāka saṃtatir āviddhā bhavati, yad asmin janmany anenedaṃ karma karaṇīyam iti/*[n] *sa tam avadhi m alaṃghayitvā tat karma karoti, yasyākaraṇāya pratibandhaṃ buddhā api bhagavanto na samarthāḥ kartum yathāhetuniyamanaṃ phalasaṃtānapariṇāmād*[124] *iti/*

The certainty of doing an action [means]: the continuity of ripening is determined (*niyamya*) and projected by former *karman*, in such a way that in this existence this action has to be done by him. In this way, not exceeding that [respective] time limit, he does that action, and not even the sublime Buddhas are able to create an obstacle so that he does not do it (lit. "for the non-doing"). Because the continuity that is the fruit transforms[123] itself according to [its] determination through the cause.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *las*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de la las*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *kyis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *kyis*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *kyi*.

[c] *gang tshe*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang gi tshe*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang tshe*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'dis las 'di*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *des 'di*.

[e] *de nges*; ASBh$_{t,PGNDC}$ *nges*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de nges*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *pa*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *mi 'gal*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *'gal*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *mi 'gal*.

[h] *de byed de/ rgyu'i*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *de byed/ de'i rgyu'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *byed de/ rgyu'i*.

[i] ASBh$_{t,PNDC}$ *pa*; ASBh$_{t,G}$ *par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[j] *rgyun gyur*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rgyur gyur*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rgyun 'gyur*.

[k] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *par*.

[l] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *spyod*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *byed*.

[m] ASBh$_{MS}$ *evaṃ*; ASBh$_{T}$ *eva*.

[n] ASBh$_{MS}$ *iti*; ASBh$_{T}$ *iti/*.

[ASBh 64,26-27] Second Certainty: Experiencing the Results

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 58b4-5] *rnam par smin pa myong bar nges pa ni/ sems pa las gyur pa'i las kyi ste*[a] *snga ma bzhin no//*

[ASBh 64,26-27] [§65(ii)] ***vipākapratisaṃvedanā niyamaḥ*** *saṃcetanīyasya karmaṇaḥ pūrvavat/*

The certainty of experiencing the ripening [is the property] of the intentional action, as [explained] above.[125]

[ASBh 64,27-29] Third Certainty: Time

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 58b5-6] *dus nges pa ni mthong ba'i chos la myong bar 'gyur ba la sogs pa'i las rnams kyi dus kyang nges par byas pa yin te/ ji ltar rnam par smin pa 'dis ni mthong ba'i chos la rnam par smin par*[b] *byed do// 'dis ni skyes nas*[c] *so// 'dis ni lan grangs gzhan la'o// zhes bya ba'o*[d]*//*

[ASBh 64,27-29] [§65(iii)] ***avasthāniyamo*** [e] *dṛṣṭadharmavedanīyādi bhir avasthāpi niyamitā bhavatīti/ yathānena vipākena dṛṣṭe dharme bhavitavyam anenopa padyānenāparasmin paryāya iti//*

The certainty of time [means]: "Even time is ascertained through [those actions that belong to the categories of] 'what is to be experienced in this life' and so on". It is as follows: "This ripening has to come about in this lifetime, this [has to come about] in the next lifetime (lit. "after rebirth") and this [has to come about] in a later lifetime (lit. "recurrence")."[126]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *kyi ste*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *kyis de*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rnam par smin par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *myong bar*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *skyes nas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PGD}$ *skye gnas*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *bya ba'o*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *bya'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bya'o*.

[e] *avasthāniyamo*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *avasthāniyamaḥ*; ASBh$_{T}$ *avasthāniyame*.

[AS 54,3-4] The Fruits of Unwholesome Actions: The Fruit of Ripening[127]

[AS$_{c}$ 679a23-24] 十不善業道異熟果者。於三惡趣中隨下中上品。受傍生餓鬼那落迦異熟。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 101b7-8] *de la mi dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam rnams kyi rnam par smin pa'i 'bras bu ni ngan song rnams su'o//*

tatra daśānām ***akuśalānāṃ karmapathānāṃ vipākaphalam*** *apāyeṣu/*

The fruit of ripening[128] of the ten unwholesome paths of action [is to be experienced] in the bad destinies.[129]

[ASBh 65,1-2] The Fruit of Ripening[130]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 58b6-7] *mi dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam rnams kyi*[a] *rnam par smin pa'i 'bras bu ni*[b] *dud 'gro dang yi dwags*[c] *dang sems can dmyal*[d] *ba rnams su rig par bya'o//*

[ASBh 65,1-2] [§66(A)] ***aku***[ASBh$_{MS}$ 59a]***śalānāṃ karmapathanāṃ*** *mṛdumadhyādhi*[e]*-mātrāṇāṃ*[f] [§66(A,i)] ***vipākaphalaṃ*** *tiryakpreta-narakeṣu veditavyam/*

The fruit of ripening of the unwholesome paths of action–[according to whether they are] mild, middling, or excessive–is to be experienced [having taken rebirth] among animals, *preta*s, or in the hells [respectively].

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNDC}$ *kyi*; ASBh$_{t,G}$ *kyis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *kyi*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ni ngan song rnams su'o// chung ngu dang/ 'bring dang/ chen po rnams te/*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *dud 'gro dang yi dwags*. ASBh$_{t,C}$ *dud 'gror dang yi dwags*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *yi dwags dang/ dud 'gro.*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *yid dags dang/ dud 'gro.*

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *sems can dmyal*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dmyal*.

[e] ASBh 65, n. 1: "Ms. *di*."

[f] ASBh 65, n. 2: "T. drops *mṛdumadhyādhimātraṇāṃ*."

[AS 54,4-5] The Concordant Fruit

[AS$_c$ 679a24-25] 等流果者。各隨其相於人趣中感得自身衆具衰損。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 101b8] *rgyu mthun pa'i 'bras bu ni so so dang mthun par*[a] *mi'i lus dang yongs su gzung ba mi*[b] *'byor pa'o//*

niṣyandaphalaṃ manuṣyeṣu pratyekam ānurūpyeṇātmabhāvaparigrahavipattiḥ/[132]

The concordant fruit[131] is that the body and the possessions [of those being reborn] among men are wretched, each one of them in a way that corresponds [to the respective bad action performed].

[ASBh 65,2-4] The Concordant Fruit

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 58b7-8] *rgyu mthun pa'i*[c] *'bras bu ni ngan song rnams nas shi 'phos nas mir skyes pa rnams kyi srog gcod pa dang ma byin par len pa*[d] *la sogs pa so so dang mthun pa'i lus dang yongs su gzung ba mi*[e] *'byor ba ste/ 'di ltar tshe thung ba dang dbul ba la sogs pa ji ltar mthun mthun du sbyar*[f] *ro//*

[ASBh 65,2-4] [§66(A,ii)] ***niṣyandaphalam*** *apāyebhyaś cyutvā* ***manuṣyeṣū****papannānāṃ* ***pratyekaṃ*** *prāṇātipātādattādānādy****ānu-rūpyeṇātmabhāvaparigraha****yor* ***vipattiḥ****/ tad-yathālpāyuṣkatā dāridryam ity evamādi yathāyogam/*

The concordant fruit is that the body and the possessions of those being reborn among men coming out of the bad destinies, are wretched, one by one, according to [the respective original action:] killing, taking what has not been given, and so on–namely being short-lived, poverty, and so on, as appropriate.

---

[a] AS$_{t,DC}$ *par*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *par*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba mi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba'i*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *pa'i*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *pa ni*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PGDN}$ *pa*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *par*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *mi*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *ni*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *mthun mthun du sbyar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rig par*.

[AS 54,5-6] The Sovereign Fruit

[AS$_c$ 679a25-26] 增上果者。各隨其相感得所有外事衰損。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 101b8] *dbang gi*[a] *'bras bu ni so so dang mthun pa nyid du phyi'i dngos po mi 'byor ba'o//*

adhipatiphalaṃ pratyekam ānurupyeṇaiva bāhyabhāvāvipattiḥ/

The sovereign fruit[133] is that external objects are wretched, one by one, according to [the respective original action].

[ASBh 65,4-6] The Sovereign Fruit

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 58b8-59a1] *bdag po'i 'bras bu ni so so dang*[b] *mthun pa nyid du phyi'i*[c] *dngos po lo tog la sogs pa mi 'byor ba ste// 'di ltar*[d] *srog gcod pa'i dbang gis ni byin chung bar*[e] *'gyur zhes bya ba la sogs pa'o*[f]*//*

[ASBh 65,4-6] [§66(A,iii)] ***adhipatiphalaṃ pratyekaṃ tadānurūpyeṇ****aiva* ***bāhyānāṃ bhāvānāṃ*** *sasyādīnāṃ*[g] ***vipattiḥ/*** *tadyathā prāṇātipātasyādhipatyenālpaujaso bhavanty eva*[h]*mādi//*[134]

The sovereign fruit (*adhipatiphala*) is that external objects, such as crops, etc., are wretched, one by one, according to that [respective original action]. Namely: Under the influence of killing, [the external objects] are of little vitality, and so on.

---

[a] *dbang gi*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *dbang gis*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *bdag po'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bdag po'i*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *so dang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *sor srog gcod pa'i rjes su*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *du phyi'i*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *du phyis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *kyi phyi'i*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ltar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *lta ste*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *byin chung bar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gzi brjid med par*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa ji ltar bshad pa'o*.

[g] ASBh$_T$ *[a]yādīnāṃ*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *syādīnāṃ*.

[h] ASBh 65, n. 3: "T. *...ntīty eva...* for *...nty eva...* ".

[AS 54,6] Beginning of the Sūtra Quotation (on the Three Fruits of Wholesome Action)

[AS$_{c}$ 679a26] 廣說如經

[AS$_{t,P}$ 102a1] *de yang mdo las ji skad du*[a]

As it is [said] in the sūtra,

tac ca ***yathāsūtram***/[135]

Abhidharmasamuccayavyākhyā: Additional leaf

[ASBh 65,7-8] ASVy: The Fruits of the Unwholesome Paths of Action: Fruit of Ripening

[ASVy$_{c}$ 728a26-27] 如經言。於一切十不善業道修習多修習故生於那落迦傍生餓鬼。是彼異熟果

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 241b7-8] *mi dge ba bcu po thams cad kyi las kyi lam goms pa la brten cing mang du byas pas dmyal ba rnams su skye'o/ de rnams su rnam par smin par myong bar*[b] *byas nas*

[ASBh 65,7-8] [§66(A,add)] [c] ***yathāsūtram*** *sarvair* [138] *daśabhir akuśalaiḥ karmapathair āsevitair bhāvitair* [139] *bahulīkṛtair narakeṣū*[d]*papadyate/*[e] *tad eṣāṃ vipākaphalam/*

As [it is said] in the sūtra: "Through all ten unwholesome paths of action, [if someone] indulges in them, practices them, does them often,[136] [he] is reborn in the hells."[137] That is their fruit of ripening.

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *de yang mdo las ji skad du*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ om.

[b] ASVy$_{t,PN}$ *par myong bar*; ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *pa myong bar*; ASVy$_{t,G}$ *par*.

[c] ASBh 65, n. 4 (for the whole additional leaf): "'*yathāsūtram ... kṛtam*' is given in an additional leaf. This passage is inserted here, following the Chinese. T. omits this passage."

[d] ASBh 65, n. 5: "Ch. *narakatiryakpreteṣu* for *narakeṣu*."

[e] Cf. AKBh 253,24 *<u>akuśalais tāvad</u> sarvair <u>ev</u>āsevit<u>a</u>bhāvit<u>ab</u>ahulīkṛtai[r] (MS: ḥ) narakeṣūpapadyate/.*

[ASBh 65,8-9] ASVy: The Fruits of Unwholesome Paths of Action: Concordant Fruit

[ASVy$_{c}$ 728a27-28] 若得來此人同分中。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 241b8] *mi dang skal pa mnyam par 'ongs pa na/*

If he comes here, into the companionship of men,[140]

[ASBh 65,8-9] *sa ced icchatva*[a]*m*[141] *āgacchati manuṣyāṇāṃ sabhāgatām*

[ASBh 65,9] ASVy: Concordant Fruit of Killing

[ASVy$_{c}$ 728a28] 由殺生故令得短壽。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 241b8] *srog gcod*[b] *pas tshe thung bar 'gyur ro//*

through [the influence of his former act of] killing, his life is short.[142]

[ASBh 65,9] [§66(A,add,1,i)] *prāṇātipātenālpāyur bhavati*

[ASBh 65,9-10] ASVy: Concordant Fruit of Taking What has not Been Given

[ASVy$_{c}$ 728a28-29] 不與取故乏少財物。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 241b8] *ma byin par blangs pas longs spyod*[c] *la chags par 'gyur ro//*

Through taking what has not been given, he is lacking wealth.[143]

[ASBh 65,9-10] [§66(A,add,1,ii)] *adattādānena bhogavyasanī bhavati/*

---

[a] ASBh 65, n. 6: "Cf. Pali *itthatta*."

[b] ASVy$_{t,PC}$ *gcod*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *bcad*; ASVy$_{t,NG}$ *gcad*.

[c] ASVy$_{t,PNG}$ *spyod*; ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *spyod pa*.

[ASBh 65,10] ASVy: Concordant Fruit of Sexual Misconduct

[ASVy$_c$ 728a29] 欲邪行故妻不貞良。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 241b8-242a1] *'dod pa la*[a] *log par spyad pas bud med rnams la 'bad pa dang bcas par 'gyur ro//*

Through sexual misconduct he has an unfaithful wife.[144]

[ASBh 65,10] [§66(A,add,1,iii)] *kāmamithyācāreṇa sasapatna*[b]*dāraḥ/*

[ASBh 65,10-11] ASVy: Concordant Fruit of Lying

[ASVy$_c$ 728a29-b1] 由虛誑語故多被誹謗。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a1] *brdzun du smras pas mi dge ba sgrogs par 'gyur ro//*

Through lying there are many wrong accusations [brought fourth] against him.[145]

[ASBh 65,10-11] [§66(A,add,1,iv)] *mṛṣāvādenābhyākhyānabahulaḥ/*

---

[a] ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *pa la*; ASVy$_{t,PNG}$ *pa*.

[b] ASBh 65, n. 7: "Ms. *sasampanna*... for *sasapatna*.... Cf. *sapatnadāraḥ* in *Abhidharmadīpa*, p. 179. Also see AK IV, 85."

[ASBh 65,11] ASVy: Concordant Fruit of Slander

[ASVy$_{c}$ 728b1] 離間語故親友乖離。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a1] *phra mas ni grogs dang dbye*[a] *bar 'gyur ro//*

Through slander, he is separated from his friends.[146]

[ASBh 65,11] [§66(A,add,1,v)] *paiśunyena* [b] *mitrabhedo 'sya bhavati/*

[ASBh 65,12] ASVy: Concordant Fruit of Harsh Words

[ASVy$_{c}$ 728b1-2] 麁惡語故恒聞不如意聲。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a1] *tshig rtsub kyis ni yid du mi 'ong ba'i sgra thos par 'gyur ro//*

Through harsh words he hears unpleasant speech.[147]

[ASBh 65,12] [§66(A,add,1,vi)] *pāruṣyeṇāmanojñaśabdaśravaṇaṃ bhavati/*

[ASBh 65,12] ASVy: Concordant Fruit of Idle Prattle

[ASVy$_{c}$ 728b2] 由綺[c]語故言不威肅。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a1-2] *tshig kyal gyis ni ngag cal*[d:] *col du 'gyur ro//*

Through idle prattle[148] his speech is not well received (lit. "not acceptable").[149]

[ASBh 65,12] [§66(A,add,1,vii)] *saṃbhinnapralāpena anādeyavākyaḥ/*

---

[a] ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *dbye*; ASVy$_{t,PN}$ *bye*; ASVy$_{t,G}$ *byed*.

[b] Additional leaf: *paiśunyena* (=Sakuma, *Index*, p. 24); ASBh$_{T}$ *paiśūnyena*.

[c] ASVy$_{c}$ 由綺; ASVy$_{c}$ (宋, 元, 明, 宮 eds.) 雜穢.

[d] ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *ngag cal*; ASVy$_{t,PNG}$ *cal*.

[ASBh 65,13] ASVy: Concordant Fruit of Covetousness

[ASVy$_{c}$ 728b2-3] 由貪欲故貪轉猛盛。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a2] *brnab sems kyis ni 'dod chags*[a] *drag par 'gyur ro//*

Through covetousness he has violent passion.[150]

[ASBh 65,13] [§66(A,add,1,viii)] *abhidhyayā tīvrarāgaḥ/*

[ASBh 65,13] ASVy: Concordant Fruit of Harmful Intent

[ASVy$_{c}$ 728b3] 由瞋恚故瞋轉猛盛。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a2] *gnod sems kyis ni zhe sdang bdo bar*[b] *'gyur ro//*

Through harmful intent he has violent hatred.[151]

[ASBh 65,13] [§66(A,add,1,ix)] *vyā*[c]*pādena tīvradveṣaḥ/*

[ASBh 65,13-14] ASVy: Concordant Fruit of Wrong View

[ASVy$_{c}$ 728b3-4] 由邪見故癡轉猛盛。諸邪見者癡增上故。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a2] *log ltas ni gti mug bdo bar*[d] *'gyur ro/ slar yang de la rmongs par 'gyur ro//*

Through wrong view he has violent delusion.[152] Because that [wrong view is something that] abounds with delusion.[153]

[ASBh 65,13-14] [§66(A,add,1,x)] *mithyādṛṣṭyā tīvramohaḥ/ tasyā mohabhūyastvāt//*

[ASBh 65,14] AKVy: Section on Concordant Fruit Ends

[ASVy$_{c}$ 728b4-5] 是彼等流果。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a3] *de rnams ni rgyu mthun pa'i 'bras bu'o//*

This is their concordant fruit.

[ASBh 65,14] *idam eṣāṃ niṣyandaphalam//*

---

[a] ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *chags*; ASVy$_{t,PNG}$ *chags dang*.

[b] ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *bdo bar*; ASVy$_{t,PNG}$ *bod par*.

[c] ASBh 65, n. 8: "MS *vyo*."

[d] ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *bdo bar*; ASVy$_{t,PNG}$ *bod par*.

[ASBh 65,14-15] ASVy: Sovereign Fruit of Killing

[ASVy$_c$ 728b5-6] 由極修習殺生業故。一切外事乏少光澤。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a3] *yang srog gcod pa bsten*[a155] *pas ni phyi rol*[b] *gyi dngos po snum bag chung bar 'gyur ro//*

Through an excessive practice of killing the outer objects come to be of little vitality.[154]

[ASBh 65,14-15] [§66(A,add,2,i)] *praṇātipātena atyāsevitena bāhyā bhāvā*[c] *alpaujaso bhavanti/*

[ASBh 65,15-16] ASVy: Sovereign Fruit of Stealing

[ASVy$_c$ 728b6] 不與取故多遭霜雹。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a3] *ma byin par blangs pas ni mi brtan zhing nyams par byed pa mang bar 'gyur ro//*

Through taking what has not been given they [endure] many thunderstorms and dust.[156]

[ASBh 65,15-16] [§66(A,add,2,ii)] *adattādānenāśanirajobahulāḥ/*

[ASBh 65,16] ASVy: Sovereign fruit of Sexual Misconduct

[ASVy$_c$ 728b6] 欲邪行故多諸塵坌。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a3-4] *'dod log spyad pas ni rdul gyis khebs par 'gyur ro//*

Through sexual misconduct [the external objects] are covered with dust.[157]

[ASBh 65,16] [§66(A,add,2,iii)] *kāma-mithyācāreṇa rajo'vakīrṇāḥ/*

---

[a] *bsten*; ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ *brten*.

[b] ASVy$_{t,PNDC}$ *rol*; ASVy$_{t,G}$ *rol tu*.

[c] ASBh 65, n. 9: "MS *vābhā* for *bhāvā*."

[ASBh 65,17] ASVy: Sovereign Fruit of Lying

[ASVy$_{c}$ 728b7] 妄[a]語故多諸臭穢。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a4] *brdzun du smras pas ni dri mi zhim par 'gyur ro//*

Through lying they are smelly.[158]

[ASBh 65,17] [§66(A,add,2,iv)] *mṛṣāvādena dur-gandhāḥ/*

[ASBh 65,17] ASVy: Sovereign Fruit of Slander

[ASVy$_{c}$ 728b7] 離間語故高下險阻。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a4] *phra mas ni kha bar 'gyur ro//*

Through slander they are uneven.[159]

[ASBh 65,17] [§66(A,add,2,v)] *paiśunyeno*[b]*tkūla-ni*[c]*kūlāḥ/*

[ASBh 65,17-18] ASVy: Sovereign Fruit of Harsh Words

[ASVy$_{c}$ 728b7-8] 麁惡語故其地鹹鹵
磽确穢惡。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a4] *tshig rtsub kyis ni mtho dman can*[162] *dang/ rtsub pa dang/ sdig pa can du 'gyur ro//*

Through harsh words they are saline, arid, wretched,[160] [growing on] bad soil.[161]

[ASBh 65,17-18] [§66(A,add,2,vi)] *pāruṣyenoṣarajaṅgalāḥ pratikruṣṭāḥ pāpa-bhūmayaḥ/*

---

[a] ASVy$_{c}$ 妄; ASVy$_{c}$ (宋, 元, 明, 宮 eds.) 虛誑.

[b] Additional leaf: *paiśūnyeno°* (= Sakuma, *Index*, p. 24). ASBh$_{T}$ *paiśūnyeno°*.

[c] ASBh 65, n. 10: "This can be read as *vi*. (Pali *ukkūlavikūla*). See BHSD."

[ASBh 65,18] ASVy: Sovereign Fruit of Idle Prattle

[ASVy$_c$ 728b8-9] 綺[a]語故時候乖變。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a4-5] *tshig kyal gyis ni mi mthun zhing*[b] *'gyur ldog can du 'gyur ro//*

Through idle prattle they [endure] irregular change in seasons.[163]

[ASBh 65,18] [§66(A,add,2,vii)] *saṃbhinna-pralāpena viṣamartupariṇāmāḥ*[c]*/*

[ASBh 65,19] ASVy: Sovereign Fruit of Covetousness

[ASVy$_c$ 728b9] 貪欲故果實尟[d]少。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a5] *brnab sems kyis ni 'bras bu rnams phra mo bar*[e] *'gyur ro//*

Through covetousness [there will be only] feeble fruits.[164]

[ASBh 65,19] [§66(A,add,2,viii)] *abhidhyayā sūkṣmaphalāḥ/*

[ASBh 65,19] ASVy: Sovereign Fruit of Harmful Intent

[ASVy$_c$ 728b9] 瞋恚故果味辛苦。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a5] *gnod sems kyis ni 'bras bu rnams ro*[f] *tsha bar 'gyur ro//*

Through harmful intent [there will be only] bitter fruit.[165]

[ASBh 65,19] [§66(A,add,2,ix)] *vyāpādena kaṭukaphalāḥ/*

---

[a] ASVy$_c$ 綺; ASVy$_c$ (宋, 元, 明, 宮 eds.) 雜穢.

[b] ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *zhing*; ASVy$_{t,PNG}$ *cing*.

[c] ASBh 65, n. 11: "MS *maḥ*."

[d] ASVy$_c$ 尠; ASVy$_c$ (明 ed.) 勘; ASVy$_c$ (CBETA ed.) 尟

[e] ASVy$_{t,PNG}$ *phra mo bar*; ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *phra mor*.

[f] *ro*; ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ngo*.

[ASBh 65,19-20] ASVy: Sovereign Fruit of Wrong View

[ASVy$_c$ 728b9-10] 邪見故果味辛苦。
或全無果

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a5-6] *log ltas ni lo thog*[a] *rnams la 'bras bu med par 'gyur ro//*

[ASBh 65,19-20] [§66(A,add,2,x)] *mithyādṛṣṭy-ālpaphalā aphalā vā/*

Through wrong view [they are] small fruits or without fruit.[166]

[ASBh 65,20] ASVy: Section on the Sovereign Fruit Ends

[ASVy$_c$ 728b10] 是彼增上果。

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a6] *de rnams ni bdag po'i 'bras bu'o//*

[ASBh 65,20]
idam eṣām adhipatiphalam//

This is their sovereign fruit.[167]

[AS 54,6-7] Sūtra Quotation on the Three Fruits of Wholesome Action (Resumed): The Fruit of Ripening

[AS$_c$ 679a27-28] 十善業道異熟果者。
於人天趣中受人天異熟。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 102a1] *dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam rnams kyi rnam par smin pa'i 'bras bu ni lha dang mi rnams kyi nang du'o//*

daśānāṃ kuśalānāṃ karmapathānāṃ vipākaphalaṃ devamanuṣyeṣu/

The fruit of ripening of the ten wholesome paths of action [is to be experienced] among gods or humans.[168]

---

[a] ASVy$_{t,NGDC}$ *lo thog*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *lo thogs.*

[ASBh 66,1] ASVy: The Fruit of Ripening of Wholesome Actions

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a6] *dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam rnams kyi rnam par smin pa'i 'bras bu ni lha dang mi rnams su'o//*

[ASBh 66,1] [§66(B,add)] ***daśānāṃ kuśalānāṃ karmapathānāṃ*** [§66(B,add,i)] ***vipākaphalaṃ devamanuṣyeṣu/***

The fruit of ripening of the ten wholesome paths of action [is to be experienced] among gods or humans.

[AS 54,7-9] Concordant Fruit of Wholesome Action

[AS$_c$ 679a28-29] 等流果者。即於彼處各隨其相感得自身衆具興盛。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 102a1] *rgyu mthun pa'i 'bras bu ni de dag nyid du so so dang mthun par lus dang/ yongs su gzung*[a] *ba phun sum tshogs pa'o//*

niṣyandaphalaṃ teṣv eva pratyekam ānurūpyeṇātmabhāvaparigrahasaṃpattiḥ//

The concordant fruit is that body and possessions [of those being reborn] in exactly those [good destinies] are excellent, one by one, according to [the respective original action].

[ASBh 66,2] ASVy: Concordant Fruit of Wholesome Actions

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a6-7] *rgyu mthun pa'i 'bras bu ni de dag nyid du so so dang mthun par lus dang/ yongs su gzung bar sbyor ba'o//*

[ASBh 66,2] [§66(B,add,ii)] ***niṣyandaphalaṃ teṣv eva pratyekam***[b] ***ānurūpyeṇātmabhāvaparigraha-saṃpattiḥ/***

The concordant fruit is that body and possessions [of those being reborn] in exactly those [good destinies] are excellent, one by one, according to [the respective original action].

---

[a] AS$_{t,DC}$ *gzung*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bzung*.

[b] ASBh$_T$ *pratyekam*; additional leaf: *pratyeka*.

[AS 54,9-10] Sovereign Fruit of Wholesome Actions

[AS$_c$ 679a29-b1] 增上果者。即於彼處各隨其相。感得所有外事興盛

[AS$_{t,P}$ 102a2] *dbang gi*[a] *'bras bu ni de dag nyid du so so dang mthun par*[b] *phyi'i dngos po phun sum tshogs pa'o*[c]*//*

adhipatiphalaṃ teṣv eva pratyekam ānurūpyeṇa bāhyānāṃ bhāvānāṃ sampattiḥ//

The sovereign fruit is that the external objects [of those being reborn] in exactly those [good destinies] are excellent, one by one, according to [the respective original action].[169]

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *dbang gi*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *bdag po'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bdag po'i*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *par*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'i*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *phun sum tshogs pa'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,DC}$ *sbyor ba'o*; ASVy$_{t,PNG}$ *sbyar ba'o*.

[ASBh 66,3] ASVy: End of Additional Leaf.

[ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a7-8] *ji ltar mi dge ba'i las kyi lam rnams kyi rnam smin gyi 'bras bu la sogs pa gsum*[a] *rnam par gzhag par byas pa ltar/*

[ASBh 66,3] [§66(AB,add,summary)] *yathākuśalānāṃ karmapathānāṃ vipāka-phalāditriphala*[b]*vyavasthānaṃ*[c] *kṛtam*[d]*//*

Just as the distinction of the three fruits–the fruit of ripening, and so on–of the unwholesome paths of action has been made, ...[170]

[ASBh 66,4-5] (Paginated MS Resumed)

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 59a1-2] *de bzhin du dge*[e] *ba bcu'i*[f] *las kyi lam zag pa dang bcas pa rnams kyi 'bras bu dag*[g] *kyang lha dang mi rnams kyi nang du*[h] *gsum gsum du 'gyur bar*[i] *ji ltar mthun mthun du*[j] *sbyar bar bya'o//*

[ASBh 66,4-5] [ASBh$_{MS}$ 59a resumed] *evaṃ kuśalānāṃ*[k] [171] *karmapathānāṃ sāsravāṇāṃ devamanuṣyeṣu trīṇi phalāni yathāyogaṃ yojayitavyāni//*

... in the same way, the three fruits of the wholesome paths of action with inflow [which are to be experienced] among gods or humans are to be supplied as appropriate.

---

[a] ASVy$_{t,PGDC}$ *gsum*; ASVy$_{t,N}$ *gsum pa.*

[b] Tatia, n. 1: "MS *la.*"

[c] Additional leaf: *vipākaphalāditriphalavasthānaṃ*; ASBh$_T$ *vipākaphalādi triphalāvasthānaṃ*. Tatia, n. 2: "Ch. *triphalaviṣeśavyavasthānaṃ.*"

[d] ASBh$_{MS}$ *tadyathā patitagrantham idaṃ dattam aṣṭapañcāśata[ḥ] patrasyādhaḥ pṛṣṭhasya// yatra pattra* 58; Tatia, n. 3: "MS gives the information about the inserted page; *patitagrantham idaṃ dattaṃ aṣṭapañcāśataḥ patrasyādhaḥ pṛṣṭhasya// yatra pattra* 58."

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *de bzhin du dge.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dge.*

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba bcu'i.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba'i.*

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *kyi 'bras bu dag kyang.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *kyi yang.*

[h] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rnams kyi nang du.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rnams su.*

[i] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gsum gsum du 'gyur bar.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'bras bu gsum ni.*

[j] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *mthun mthun du.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rig par.*

[k] *kuśalānāṃ*; ASBh$_{T,MS}$ *kuśalādīnāṃ*; Tatia, n. 4: "Ch. omits *ādi*. T. *daśānāṃ kuśalānāṃ.*"

[AS 54,11-12] *Karman* That Entails and Fullfills

[AS$_{c}$ 679b2-3] 善不善業。於善趣惡趣中感生異熟時。有招引業圓滿業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 102a2-3] *dge ba dang mi dge ba'i las kyis*[a][174] *ni bde 'gro dang ngan 'gror skye ba'i*[b] *'phen pa dang/ yongs su rdzogs par byed pa'i las su rig par bya'o//*

kuśalākuśalasya karmaṇaḥ sugatidurgatyor upapattyākṣepaṇam paripūraṇaṃ ca karma veditavyam/ (?)[175]

It is to be understood that wholesome and unwholesome *karman* has the function (*karman*) of entailing[172] and fulfilling[173] rebirth in a good or bad destiny.

[AS 54,12-13] Explanation of "Entailing"[176]

[AS$_{c}$ 679b3-4] 招引業者。謂由此業能感[c]異熟果。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 102a3] *'phen pa ni gang gis*[d] *rnam par smin pa 'phen pa'o//*

ākṣepaṇaṃ yena vipākam ākṣipati/[178]

"Entailing" is [the function] through which [*karman*] entails ripening.[177]

[AS 54,13] Explanation of "Fulfilling"

[AS$_{c}$ 679b4] 圓滿業者。謂由此業生已領受愛不愛果。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 102a4] *yongs su rdzogs par byed pa ni gang gis skyes pa na*[e][180] *'dod pa dang mi 'dod pa myong ba'o//*

paripūraṇaṃ yenopapanna iṣṭāniṣṭam pratisaṃvedayate/ (?)[181]

Fulfilling is [the function] through which, once one is reborn,[179] one experiences what is wanted or unwanted.

---

[a] AS$_{t,DC}$ *kyis*; AS$_{t,P}$ *kyi* (+ double *tsheg*; letter erased?); AS$_{t,NG}$ *kyi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *kyis*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *ba'i*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba*.

[c] AS$_{c}$ 感. Cf. AS$_{c}$ (中華: 石 ed.) 引.

[d] AS$_{t,GNDC}$ *gis*; AS$_{t,P}$ *gi+* (suffix illegible). Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gis*.

[e] AS$_{t,DC}$ *skyes pa na*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *skyes pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *skyes pa n+*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *skyes pa ni*.

[AS 54,14-15] One or Many Actions Entail One or Many Existences[182]

[AS$_c$ 679b5-7] 或有業由一業力牽得一身。或有業由一業力牽得多身。或有業由多業力牽得一身。或有業由多業力牽得多身。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 102a4-5] *las gcig gis lus gcig 'phen*[a] *pa'i las kyang*[184] *yod/ las gcig gis lus du ma 'phen*[b] *pa'i las kyang yod/ las*[c] *du mas lus gcig 'phen pa'i las kyang yod/ las*[d] *du mas lus*[e] *du ma 'phen pa'i las kyang yod*[f]*/*

*asty karmai**kena** **karmaṇā ekam ātmabhāvam ākṣipati**/ asty karmai**kena** karmaṇā**nekam** ātmabhāvam **ākṣipati**/ asty karmā**nekena** karmaṇai**kam** ātmabhāvam **ākṣipati**/ asty karmā**nekena** karmaṇā**nekam** ātmabhāvam **ākṣipati**//*

There is [the case that][183] action entails a single existence through a single action. There is [also the case that] action entails many existences through a single action. There is [also the case that] action entails a single existence through many actions. There is [also the case that] action entails many existences through one action.

[ASBh 66,6-7] One Action Entails One Existence

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 59a2-3] *las gcig gis lus gcig 'phen pa ni las kyi skad cig gcig gis tshe gcig kho na'i rnam par smin pa'i sa bon gsos pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 66,6-7] [§67(i)] ***ekena karmaṇā ekam ātmabhāvam ākṣipati****, ekena karma-kṣaṇenai*[g]*ka janmikasyaiva vipākasya bījapoṣaṇāt/*

[A kind of action] entails one existence through one action, because [it] nourishes the seed for the ripening of exactly one birth through one moment of action.

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *'phen*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *'phen par byed*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'phen*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *'phen*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *'phen par byed*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'phen*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *las*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *las gzhi*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *las*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *las gzhi*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *lus*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *lus*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *lung*.

[f] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *yod*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *yod do*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yod do*.

[g] ASBh$_T$ *karma[kṣa]ṇen[a]*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *karmaṇen[a]*.

[ASBh 66,7-8] One Action Entails Many Existences

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 59a3] *gcig gis du ma*[a] *'phen pa ni/ de nyid kyis*[b] *tshe rabs du ma'i rnam par smin pa'i sa bon gsos pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 66,7-8] [§67(ii)] ***ekenānekam ākṣipati,*** *tenaivānekajanmikavipākabījapoṣaṇāt/*

[A kind of action] entails many [existences] through one [action], because [it] nourishes the seed for the ripening of many births through exactly that [moment of action].

[ASBh 66,8-9] Many Actions Entail one Existence

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 59a3-4] *du mas gcig 'phen pa ni/ las kyi skad cig mang pos*[c] *de gcig po nyid kyi sa bon yang dang yang*[d] *gsos pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 66,8-9] [§67(iii)] ***anekenaikam ākṣipati,*** *bahubhiḥ karmakṣaṇaiḥ tasyaivaikasya punaḥ punaḥ bījapoṣaṇāt/*

[A kind of action] entails one [existence] through many [actions], because [it] nourishes the seed for the ripening of exactly that one [birth] through numerous moments of action.

[ASBh 66,9-10] Many Actions Entail Many Existences

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 59a3-4] *du mas du ma 'phen pa ni mang po dag phan tshun bltos*[e] *nas tshe rabs gcig nas gcig tu*[f] *brgyud pa'i*[g] *sa bon gsos pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 66,9-10] [§67(iv)] ***anekenānekam ākṣipati,*** *bahubhir anyonyāpekṣayā janmaparamparābījapoṣaṇād iti//*

[A kind of action] entails many [existences] through many [actions], because [it] nourishes again and again the seed[s] for the ripening of a series of births through numerous [moments of action] in mutual dependence.[185]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *du ma*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *du ma'i.*

[b] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *kyis*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *kyi.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *kyis*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *kyi.*

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pos.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *po de nyid kyis.*

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *de gcig po nyid kyi sa bon yang dang yang*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *gcig po de nyid kyi sa bon yang dang yang.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yang dang yang sa bon.*

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *bltos*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *ltos.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bltos*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *ltos.*

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gcig nas gcig tu.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *phan tshun.*

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'i.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de.*

[AS 54,15-16] Question about the Order of the Fruit of Ripening[186]

[AS$_{c}$ 679b7-8] 若一有情成就多業。云何次第受異熟果。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 102a5] *las mang po dang ldan pa'i sems can*[a] *ji ltar rim gyis rnam par smin pa myong bar 'gyur zhe na*[b]*/*

bahukarmasamanvāgataḥ sattvaḥ kathaṃ krameṇa vipākaphalaṃ pratisaṃvedayati (?)/

How does a living being that is furnished with[187] many *karmas* experience the fruit of [their] ripening successively?[188]

[AS 54,16-18] The Order of Ripening

[AS$_{c}$ 679b8-10] 於彼身中重者先熟。或將死時現在前者。或先所數習者。或最初所行者。彼異熟先熟

[AS$_{t,P}$ 102a5-6] *de la gang shin tu lci bar gyur pa de thog mar rnam par smin par 'gyur ro// yang na 'chi ba'i dus na gang mngon*[c] *du gyur pa'o// yang na gang*[d] *goms par gyur pa'o// yang na gang thog mar spyad pa de thog ma nyid du rnam par smin*[e] *par 'gyur ro//*

tatra yad gurutaraṃ tad ādau[191] *vipacyate/ yad vā maraṇakāle abhimukhībhūtam/ yad vābhyastam/ yad vā prathamaṃ samācaritam tad ādāv eva vipacyate//*

Here, what is most heavy ripens first, or, what has become manifest at the time of death,[189] or that which has been [frequently] cultivated, or what has been done first will ripen as the very first.[190]

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *can*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *can rnams*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'gyur zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'gyur*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *mngon*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *mngon*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *sngon*.

[d] AS$_{t,DC}$ *na gang*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *na gang*.

[e] AS$_{t,DC}$ *rnam par smin*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *smin*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rnam par smin*.

[AS 54,19-20] Meritorious, Demeritorious and Immovable Action[192]

[AS$_c$ 679b11] 如契經言。有三種業。謂福業非福業不動業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 102a7-8] *bsod*[a] *nams kyi las dang/ bsod*[b] *nams ma yin pa'i las dang/ mi g.yo ba'i las shes*[c] *gang 'byung ba*[d]

yad uktaṃ puṇyam karmāpuṇyam karmāniṃjyaṃ karma iti/

[As for] what is said [in the sūtra]:"meritorious, demeritorious and immovable action".

[AS 54,20] Definition of Meritorious *Karman*

[AS$_c$ 679b12] 何等福業。謂欲界繫善業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 102a7] *de la*[e]*/ bsod*[f] *nams gang zhe na*[g]*/ gang 'dod pa dang rab tu ldan pa'i dge ba'o//*

tatra puṇyaṃ katamat/ yat kāmapratisaṃyuktaṃ kuśalaṃ/

What is meritorious? That which is wholesome, connected with the [realm of] desire.

[AS 54,20-21] Definition of Demeritorious *Karman*

[AS$_c$ 679b12-13] 何等非福業。謂不善業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 102a7-8] *bsod*[h] *nams ma yin pa gang zhe na*[i]*/ gang mi dge ba'o//*

apuṇyaṃ katamat/ yad akuśalaṃ/

What is demeritorious? That which is unwholesome.

---

[a] AS$_{t,PGDC}$ *bsod*; AS$_{t,N}$ *gsod.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PND}$ *bsod.*

[b] AS$_{t,PGDC}$ *bsod*; AS$_{t,N}$ *gsod.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PND}$ *bsod.*

[c] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *shes*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *zhes.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PND}$ *zhes.*

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'byung ba.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PND}$ *bshad pa.*

[e] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *de la*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *la.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PND}$ *la.*

[f] AS$_{t,PGDC}$ *bsod*; AS$_{t,N}$ *gsod.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PND}$ *bsod.*

[g] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang.*

[h] AS$_{t,PGDC}$ *bsod*; AS$_{t,N}$ *gsod.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PND}$ *bsod.*

[i] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PND}$ *gang.*

[AS 54,21] Definition of Immovable *Karman*[193]

[AS$_c$ 679b13] 何等不動業。謂色無色界繫善業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 102a8] *mi g.yo ba'i las gang zhe na*[a]*/ gang gzugs dang gzugs med pa dang rab tu ldan pa'i dge ba'o//*

ānimjyam *karma katamat/ yad* ***rūpārūpyaprati-saṃyuktaṃ kuśalaṃ//***

What is the immovable action? That which is wholesome, connected with the [both] the material and immaterial realms.

[ASBh 66,11] Question: Why is It Called "Immovable"

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 59a4-5] *ci'i phyir gzugs dang gzugs med pa dang rab tu ldan pa'i dge ba la mi g.yo ba zhes bya zhe*[b] *na/*

[ASBh 66,11-12] [§68] *kena kāraṇena* ***rūpārūpya-pratisaṃyuktaṃ kuśalam ānimjyam*** *i*[ASBh$_{MS}$ 59b]*ty ucyate/*

For what reason is that which is wholesome, connected with the material and immaterial realm called "immovable"?

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PND}$ *gang*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bya zhe*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bshad ce*.

[ASBh 66,12-13] Reply: Reasons for the Name "Immovable"

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 59a5-6] *ji ltar 'dod pa na spyod pa'i 'gro ba gzhan gyi yongs su rdzogs par*[a] *byed pa'i*[b] *dge ba ni*[c] *gzhan du rnam par smin pa 'byin par byed*[d] *pa de bzhin du*[e]*/ gzugs dang gzugs med pa na spyod pa*[f] *ni de lta*[g] *ma yin te/ sa'i*[h] *nges pas 'bras bu 'byin pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 66,12-13] *yathā kāmāvacaram anyagatikam api*[i] *paripūrakaṃ kuśalamūla*[j]*m anyatra vipākaṃ prayacchati, naivaṃ rūpārūpyā*[k] *vacaram,*[l] *bhūminaiyamyena phaladānāt/*

"The complementary (*paripūraka*)[194] wholesome root that pertains to the realm of desire, even if it belongs to one destiny (*gati*), [can also] bring forth its ripening in another [destiny].[195] [The wholesome] pertaining to the material and the immaterial realm is not like that, because it yields its fruit at some definite level.[196]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yongs su rdzogs par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rdzogs*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *byed pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *byed*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *byed*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'gyur*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa de bzhin du*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *la*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *na spyod pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *spyod pa na*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ni de lta*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ni*.

[h] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *sa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *sa*.

[i] Tatia, n. 5: "T. & Ch. omit api."

[j] Tatia, n. 6: "T. *kuśalaṃ*, Ch. *kuśalākuśalakarma* for *kuśalamūla*."

[k] Tatia, n. 7: "MS *pā*."

[l] *rūpārūpyāvacaram* (=Sakuma, *Index*, p. 24); ASBh$_T$ *rūpyārūpyāvacaram*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *rūpyārūpāvacaram*.

[ASBh 66,14-15] Reply: Reasons for the Name "Immovable", Conclusion

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 59a6-7] *de bas na rnam par smin pa 'byin par g.yo ba med pa dang/ mnyam par bzhag*[a] *pa'i sa pa yin pas mi g.yo ba'i phyir mi g.yo ba zhes bshad do//*

[ASBh 66,14-15] *ato vipākadānaṃ praty akampa-nārthenāniṃjyam uktam [/] samāhitabhūmikatvāc cākampanārthe neti*[b]*//*

Therefore, it is called "immovable" in the sense that it is not shaking with regard to yielding its ripening. And [also] in the sense that it is not shaking[197] because it belongs to a level of absorption."

[AS 54,22] Sūtra Quotation: The Impulses Are Based on Ignorance[198]

[AS$_c$ 679b14] 如契經說。無明緣行。若福非福及與不動。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 102a8-102b1] *ma rig pa'i rkyen gyis*[c] *bsod nams dang bsod*[d] *nams ma yin pa dang mi g.yo ba'i 'du byed rnams so zhes gang gsungs pa*

yad uktam avidyāpratyayāḥ saṃskārāḥ puṇyā apuṇyā āniṃjyāś ceti/

It has been said [in the sūtra]: "ignorance is the condition of the impulses (*saṃskārāḥ*); [they are] meritorious, demeritorious and immovable."

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bzhag*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bzhag*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gzhag*.

[b] ASBh$_T$ *akampanārthe[ne]ti*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *akampanārtheti*.

[c] AS$_{t,DC}$ *gyis*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *gyi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gyis*.

[d] AS$_{t,DC}$ *bsod nams dang bsod*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bsod*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bsod nams dang bsod*.

[AS 54,22-55,1] In how far are Meritorious and Immovable Impulses Based on Ignorance?

[AS_c 679b14-15] 云何福及不動行緣無明生。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 102b1] *de la/ ji ltar na*[a] *bsod*[b] *nams dang bsod*[c] *nams ma yin pa dang mi g.yo ba'i 'du byed rnams ma rig pa'i rkyen las 'byung*[d] *ba yin zhe na*[e]*/*

How do meritorious, demeritorious and immovable impulses come about with ignorance as [their] condition?

tatra kathaṃ puṇyāpuṇyā āniṃjyāś ca saṃskārā avidyāpratyayāḥ saṃbhavanti/

[AS 55,1-2] Two Kinds of Bewilderment[199]

[AS_c 679b15-16]有二種愚。一異熟果愚。二眞實義愚。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 102b1-2] *rmongs pa ni gnyis te/ 'bras bu rnam par smin pa la rmongs pa dang/ de kho na'i don la rmongs pa'o//*

There are two kinds of bewilderment. Bewilderment with regard to the ripening of the fruit and bewilderment with regard to true reality.

dvividhaḥ saṃmohaḥ/[200] *phalavipākasaṃmohas tattvārthasaṃmohaś ca/*

---

[a] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *ltar na*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *ltar*.

[b] $AS_{t,PGDC}$ *bsod*; $AS_{t,N}$ *gsod*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *bsod*.

[c] $AS_{t,PGDC}$ *bsod*; $AS_{t,N}$ *gsod*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *bsod*.

[d] $AS_{t,PNG}$ *'byung*; $AS_{t,DC}$ *byung*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *byung*.

[e] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[AS 55,2-3] Results of the Two Kinds of Bewilderment

[AS_c 679b16-17] 由異熟果愚故發非福行。由眞實義愚故發福及不動行

[$AS_{t,P}$ 102b2-3] *'bras bu rnam par smin pa la rmongs pa'i*[a] *ni mi dge ba'i 'du byed rnams 'byung ngo// de kho na'i don la rmongs pa'i*[b] *ni bsod nams dang mi g.yo ba rnams so//*

phalavipākasaṃmūḍhasyāpuṇyāḥ saṃskārāḥ saṃbhavanti tattvārthasaṃmūḍhasya puṇyāniṃjyāḥ/

For someone who is bewildered with regard to the ripening of the fruit, demeritorious impulses come about. For someone who is bewildered with regard to true reality, meritorious and immovable [impulses come about].

[ASBh 66,16-18] Bewilderment About the Ripening of the Fruit

[$ASBh_{t,P}$ 59a7-8] *'bras*[c] *bu rnam par smin pa la rmongs pa ni mi dge ba'i*[201] *'du byed rnams 'byung ngo zhes bya ba ni de dag gi*[d] *ni gcig tu nyon mongs pa can yin*[e] *pas ma rig pa yong bar gyur na 'bras bu rnam par smin pa la mngon par yid ches pa'i rnam pa'i yang dag pa'i lta ba'i skabs med pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 66,16-18] ***phalavipāka-saṃmūḍhasyāpuṇyāḥ saṃskārāḥ saṃbhavanti/*** *teṣām ekāntakliṣṭatvenāvidyāsāṃnidhye sati phalavipākābhisaṃpratyayākārāyāḥ samyagdṛṣṭer anavakāśāt/*

For the someone who is bewildered with regard to the ripening of the fruit, demeritorious impulses come about. Because, when ignorance is present, there is no occasion for the right view that consists in a firm belief in the ripening of the fruit, as those [impulses] are solely defiled.

---

[a] $AS_{t,DC}$ *pa'i*; $AS_{t,PNG}$ *pa*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[b] $AS_{t,DC}$ *pa'i*; $AS_{t,PNG}$ *pa*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[c] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *'bras*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *de la 'bras*.

[d] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *gi*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *gis*.

[e] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,P}$ *yin*; $ASVy_{t,D}$ *ma yin*.

[ASBh 66,18-19] Bewilderment About True Reality: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 59a8-59b1] *de kho na'i don la rmongs pa ni bsod nams dang*[a] *mi g.yo ba rnams so// zhes bya ba la de kho na'i don ces*[b] *bya ba ni 'phags pa'i bden pa bzhi po dag go//*

[ASBh 66,18-19] ***tattvārthasaṃmūḍhasya puṇyāniṃjyās/*** *tattvārtha ucyate catvāry ārya satyāni/*

For someone who is bewildered with regard to true reality, meritorious and immovable [impulses come about]. [Here] the Four Noble Truths are what is called true reality.[202]

[ASBh 66,19-21] Bewilderment About the True Reality is the Cause for Saṃsāric Existence

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 59b1-2] *de la rmongs na dge ba'i sems yod du zin kyang bden pa ma mthong ba rnams la bag la nyal gyi rjes su 'brel par 'gyur ro// de'i dbang gis de dag khams gsum pa sdug bsngal nyid du yang dag pa*[c] *ji lta ba*[d] *bzhin du yongs su ma shes pa'i phyir yang srid pa'i rgyur gyur pa'i bsod nams dang mi g.yo ba'i 'du byed rnams slong bar byed do//*

[ASBh 66,19-21] *tatra saṃmohaḥ*[e] *kuśala-cittānām apy adṛṣṭasatyānām anuśayato 'nubaddho bhavati/ yadvaśena te duḥkhatas traidhātukasya yathābhūtam aparijñānāt*[f] *punar-bhavahetubhūtān puṇyāniṃjya saṃskārān*[g] *utthāpayanti/*

Bewilderment with regard to that [true reality] continues as a latent defilement for those who, although they have wholesome thoughts, have not seen the [four] truths. [It is a latent defilement] on account of which those [who have not seen the four truths] do not comprehend the [world] consisting of the three realms as it is, [namely] as suffering.[203] And therefore [those] give rise to the meritorious and immovable impulses which are [then] a cause for rebirth.[204]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *dang*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *dang ye shes*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dang*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *ces*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *zhes*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ces*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *pa*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *par*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *ba*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *ba ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba*.

[e] Tatia, n.8: "Ch. inserts *tattvārthasaṃmohaḥ*."

[f] ASBh$_{T}$ *aparijñānāt*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *aparijñānā* (letter after *ā* erased).

[g] ASBh$_{T,MS}$ *puṇyāniṃjyasaṃskārān*. See also SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 537, n. 1438: *puṇyāniṃjyān saṃskārān* (?).

[ASBh 66,21-22] No Bewilderment About the True Reality for the Ārya

[$ASBh_{t,P}$ 59b2-3] *bden pa mthong ba rnams ni de lta*[a] *ma yin te/ de*[b] *kho na'i don la rmongs pa med pa'i phyir ro// de bas na de dag ni de'i rgyu las byung ba rnams shes bya'o*[c]*//*

[ASBh 66,21-22] *na tv evaṃ dṛṣṭasatyās, tattvārthasaṃmohābhāvāt/*[d] *atas te taddhetukā ity ucyante//*

But those who have seen the Truths are not like that, because there is no bewilderment with regard to true reality [for them]. Therefore those [impulses] are called "having that (i.e. ignorance) as their cause".

[AS 55,4-5] Killing: Three Defilements (*kleśa*) for Its Preparation, One for Completion[205]

[AS_c 679b18-19] 殺生業道貪瞋癡爲方便。由瞋究竟。如殺生麁惡語瞋恚業道亦爾。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 102b3-4] *srog gcod pa la ni chags pa dang zhe sdang dang gti mug gis sbyor*[e] *te/ zhe sdang gis ni*[f] *mthar phyin par byed do// srog gcod pa la ji lta bar*[g] *ngag rtsub po*[h] *dang/ gnod sems la yang de bzhin no//*

prāṇātipātasya lobhadveṣamohaiḥ[206] ***prayogaḥ/ dveṣeṇa*** *niṣṭhā/ yathā prāṇātipātasyaivam paruṣa-vāgvyāpādayor api/*

The preparation for killing [comes about] through greed, hatred and delusion, its accomplishment through hatred. [The preparation for] harsh speech and harmful intent is exactly like that of killing.

---

[a] $ASBh_{t,PNGD}$ *lta*; $ASBh_{t,C}$ *ltar*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *lta*.

[b] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *de*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,D}$ *de*; $ASVy_{t,P}$ *de'i*.

[c] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *shes bya'o*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,P}$ *shes bshad do*, $ASVy_{t,D}$ *zhes bshad do*.

[d] $ASBh_T$ *tattvārthasaṃmohābhāvāt/*; $ASBh_{MS}$ *tattvārthasaṃmohābhāvād*.

[e] $AS_{t,DC}$ *gis sbyor*; $AS_{t,PNG}$ *gis sbyar*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,D}$ *gis sbyor*; $ASVy_{t,P}$ *gi sbyor*.

[f] $AS_{t,PNG}$ *gis ni*; $AS_{t,DC}$ *gis*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *gis ni*.

[g] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *lta bar*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *ltar*.

[h] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *po*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *mo*.

[ASBh 66,23-25] Defilements for Preparation and Completion of Killing: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 59b3-5] *srog gcod pa*[a] *la yang*[b] *sha la sogs pa 'dod pa rnams ni chags pas sbyor ro*[c]*// sha glon par 'dod pa rnams*[d] *ni zhe sdang gis sbyor ro// mchod sbyin la sogs pa ni*[e] *gti mug gis sbyor ro// zhe sdang nyid kyis*[f] *ni mthar phyin par byed de/ snying rje med pa ma yin par sems can gsod mi srid pa'i phyir ro// ngag*[g] *rtsub po*[h] *la sogs pa la yang ji ltar mthun mthun du*[i] *sbyar bar bya'o//*

[ASBh 66,23-25] [§ 69] ***prāṇātipātasya lobhena prayogo*** *māṃsikādīnām/* ***dveṣeṇa***[j] [210] *vairaniryātanakāmānām*[k]*/* ***mohena*** *yājñikādīnām/* ***dveṣeṇaiva niṣṭhā*** *nirghṛṇatām antareṇa parasattvavipādanāsaṃbha*[ASBh$_{MS}$ 60a]*vāt/ evaṃ pāruṣyādīnāṃ yathāyogaṃ yojayitavyam/*

The preparation for killing [comes about] through greed, as with butchers, and so on.[207] Through hatred, as with those who want revenge for [some] hostility.[208] Through delusion, as with those who practice [animal] sacrifice, and so on. Its accomplishment [comes about] only through hatred. Because without mercilessness the killing of another being does not come about. [Those factors are] to be applied to harsh words and so on[209] as appropriate.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *srog gcod pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *la yang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *la*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pas sbyor ro*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *pa sbyar ro*. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *pa sbyor ba'o*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *sha glon par 'dod pa rnams*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *zhes 'gras pa la lan ldon pa*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *la sogs pa ni*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *la sogs pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rnams la*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *nyid kyis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gis*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ngag*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de ltar ngag*.

[h] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *po*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[i] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *mthun mthun du*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *rigs par*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *rig par*.

[j] ASBh$_{MS}$ +++*dveṣeṇa*; ASBh$_{T}$ *dveṣeṇaiva*.

[k] ASBh$_{T}$ *vairaniryātanakāmānām*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *vairaniyātanakāmānām*.

[AS 55,5-7] Preparation and Completion of Taking what has not Been Given: Defilements

[AS_c 679b19-21] 不與取業道貪瞋癡爲方便。由貪究竟。如不與取欲邪行貪欲業道亦爾。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 102b4-5] *ma byin par len pa la ni*[a] *chags pa*[b] *dang zhe sdang dang/ gti mug gis sbyor te/ chags pas mthar phyin*[c] *par byed do// ma byin par len pa la*[d] *ji lta bar 'dod pa la*[e] *log par g.yem pa dang/ brnab sems la yang de bzhin no//*

adattādāna*sya* ***lobha****dveṣamohaiḥ* ***prayogaḥ****/ lobhena niṣṭhā/ yathādattādānasyaivaṃ kāma-mithyācārābhidhyayoḥ/*

The preparation for taking what has not been given [comes about] through greed, hatred and delusion, its accomplishment through greed. [The preparation and accomplishment of] sexual misconduct and covetousness is exactly like that of taking what has not been given.

[ASBh 67,1-2] Preparation for Covetousness: Transmitted Doctrine

[$ASBh_{t,P}$ 59b5-6] *brnab sems la sogs pa la ji ltar chags pa la sogs pas sbyor zhe na/ de la brnab sems kyi las kyi lam ni*[f] *gzhan gyi*[g] *nor dang yo byad bdag gir byed par nges pa'o// zhes bstan pa*

[ASBh 67,1-2] *abhidhyādīnāṃ kathaṃ lobhādibhiḥ prayogaḥ/ tatrābhidhyākarmapathaḥ paravittopakaraṇa svīkaraṇaniścaya ity uktam/*

How [does] the preparation for covetousness, etc. [come about] through greed, etc.? It has been taught that the path of action of covetousness consists in the determination (*niścaya*) to make another's riches and commodities one's own.[211]

---

[a] $AS_{t,DC}$ *la ni*; $AS_{t,PNG}$ *ni*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *ni*.

[b] $AS_{t,PNG}$ *chags pa*; $AS_{t,DC}$ *'dod chags*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *chags pa*.

[c] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *phyin*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,D}$ *phyin*; $ASVy_{t,D}$ *'byin*.

[d] $AS_{t,DC}$ *pa la*; $AS_{t,PNG}$ *pa*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *pa la*.

[e] $AS_{t,DC}$ *pa la*; $AS_{t,PNG}$ *pas*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *pa la*.

[f] $ASBh_{t,PNG}$ *ni*; $ASBh_{t,DC}$ *ni gal te*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *ni*.

[g] $ASBh_{t,PNGD}$ *gyi*; $ASBh_{t,C}$ *gyis*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *gyi*.

[ASBh 67,2-5] Preparation for Covetousness: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 59b6-8] *de la*[a] *gzhan gyi nor dang yo byad de nyid 'dod par gyur na/ de*[b] *bdag gir bya ba'i phyir mngon par 'du byed de/ de'i phyir chags pas sbyor bar*[c] *rnam par gzhag*[d] *go// ci ste*[e] *'di*[f] *yir ma gyur cig ce na/ de ltar*[g] *na ni zhe sdang gis sbyor ro// ci*[h] *ste gzhan gyi*[i] *bdag gir*[j] *byas kyang nyes pa ci yang med do snyam na gti mug gis sbyor bar rig par*[k] *bya'o// gzhan la yang de bzhin du sbyar bar bya'o//*

[ASBh 67,2-5] *tad yadi*[l] *tenaiva vittopakaraṇenārthī bhavan tatsvīkaraṇāyābhisaṃskaroty*[m] *ato 'sya lobhena prayogo vyavasthāpyate/ atha maivasya bhūd ity evaṃ dveṣeṇa/ atha parasvasvīkaraṇe*[n] *na kaścid doṣa iti, mohena prayogo veditavyaḥ/ evam anyad api yojayitavyam//*

Now, if someone, yearning for exactly those riches and commodities, forms the decision to make them his own, then his preparation is established through greed. If, however, [someone thinks]: "[That] shall by no means be his [possession]!", in that way [the preparation comes about] through hatred. If however [someone thinks]: "Now, there is no fault in making another's [possession] one's own!", in that way one has to understand that the preparation [comes about] through delusion.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *la*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *la gal te*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *la*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *de*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *de*. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *de dag*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *gzhag*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *bzhag*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gzhag*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bzhag*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ci ste*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *ji ste*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *ji lta*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNDC}$ *'di*; ASBh$_{t,G}$ *'dir*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'di*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ltar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *lta*.

[h] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ci*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ji*.

[i] *gyi*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gyis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gyi*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gyis*.

[j] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *gir*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *gis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gir*.

[k] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rig par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *lta bar*.

[l] ASBh 67, n. 1: "T. *tatra*, but Ch. supports Ms."

[m] *bhavan tatsvīkaraṇāyābhisaṃskaroty*; ASBh$_{T}$ *bhava[ti] tatsvīkaraṇāyābhisaṃskaroty*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *bhavetatsvīkaraṇāyābhisaṃskaroty* (?).

[n] *parasvasvīkaraṇe*; ASBh$_{T,MS}$ *parasvīkaraṇe*.

[AS 55,7-8] Defilements That Bring About the Preparation and Completion of Lying

[AS$_c$ 679b21-23] 虛誑語業道貪瞋癡爲方便。於三種中隨由一究竟。如虛誑語離間語雜穢語業道亦爾。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 102b5-6] *brdzun du smra ba*[a] *la ni chags pa dang zhe sdang dang gti mug gis sbyor*[b] *te/ gsum po dag las*[c] *gang yang rung bas*[d] *mthar phyin par byed do// brdzun du smra ba la ji lta bar phra ma dang/ tshig kyal pa la*[e] *yang de bzhin no//*[f]

mṛṣāvādasya lobhadveṣamohaiḥ prayogaḥ/ trayaṇām anyatamena niṣṭhā/ yathā mṛṣavādasyaivaṃ saṃbhinnapralāpapiśunavācoḥ/

The preparation for lying [comes about] through greed, hatred and delusion, its accomplishment through any of the three. [The preparation for] idle prattle and slander is exactly like that of lying.[212]

[AS 55,8-9] Defilements That Bring About the Preparation and Completion of Wrong Views

[AS$_c$ 679b23] 邪見業道貪瞋癡爲方便。由癡究竟。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 102b6] *log par lta ba la ni*[g] *chags pa dang zhe sdang dang gti mug gis sbyor te/ gti mug gis mthar phyin par byed do/*

mithyādṛṣṭer lobhadveṣamohaiḥ prayogaḥ/ mohena niṣṭhā/

The preparation for wrong view [comes about] through greed, hatred and delusion, its accomplishment through delusion.

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba rnams*.

[b] AS$_{t,NGDC}$ *gis sbyor*; AS$_{t,P}$ *gi+ sbyor* . Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gis sbyor*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gis sbyar*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *po dag las*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *dag la*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *po*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bas*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *ba*.

[e] AS$_{t,DC}$ *kyal pa la*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *kyal pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'khyal pa la*.

[f] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *no//*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *no// brdzun ni mthong ba la chags pa dang/ zhes sdang dang/ gti mug gis sbyor par 'gyur ro*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *no// brdzun ni mthong ba la chags pa dang/ zhes sdang dang/ gti mug gis spyod par 'gyur ro*.

[g] AS$_{t,DC}$ *ba la ni*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *ba ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba la yang*.

[AS 55,10] Common and Individual *Karman*, Strong and Weak *Karman*[213]

[AS_c 679b24-25] 如契經言。有共業。有不共業。有強力業。有劣力業。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 102b6-7] *las thun*[a] *mong ba zhes kyang 'byung*[b]*/ las thun*[c] *mong ma yin pa zhes kyang 'byung*[d]*/ stobs dang ldan pa zhes kyang 'byung*[e]*/ mthu chung ba zhes kyang 'byung ba*[f] *la/*

sādhāraṇaṃ *karmety apy uktaṃ* ***asādharaṇaṃ*** *karmety apy uktaṃ* ***balavat*** *karmety*[214] *apy uktaṃ durbalaṃ karmety apy uktaṃ/*[215]

"Common *karman*" has been mentioned [in the sūtra], also "individual *karman*", as well as "strong *karman*" and "weak *karman*".

[AS 55,11] Common *Karman*: Definition[216]

[AS_c 679b25-26] 云何共業。若業能令諸器世間種種差別。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 102b7] *thun mong ba gang zhe na/ gang*[g] *snod kyi 'jig rten rnam par 'byed pa'o//*

sādhāraṇaṃ katamat/ yad bhājanaloka-vibhājakam/[219]

What is common *karman*?[217] It is that which differentiates the receptacle world.[218]

---

[a] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *thun*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,D}$ *thun*; $ASVy_{t,P}$ *mthun*.

[b] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba zhes kyang 'byung*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,P}$ *bar kyang bshad*; $ASVy_{t,D}$ *bar yang bshad*.

[c] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *las thun*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *thun*.

[d] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa zhes kyang 'byung*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,P}$ *par kyang bshad*; $ASVy_{t,D}$ *par yang bshad*.

[e] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa zhes kyang 'byung*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,P}$ *par kyang bshad*. $ASVy_{t,D}$ *par yang bshad*.

[f] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba zhes kyang 'byung ba*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,P}$ *bar kyang bshad pa*; $ASVy_{t,D}$ *par yang bshad pa*.

[g] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na/ gang*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,D}$ *gang/ gang*; $ASVy_{t,P}$ *gang dang*.

[AS 55,12-13] Individual *Karman*: Definition

[AS_c 679b26-27] 云何不共業。若業能令有情世間種種差別。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 102b7-8] *thun mong ma yin pa gang zhe na*[a]*/ gang sems can gyi 'jig rten rnam par 'byed pa'o//*

asādhāraṇaṃ katamat/ yat sattvalokavibhājakam/

What is individual *karman*? It is that which differentiates the world of beings.

[a] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[AS 55,13-16] Common *Karman*: Explanation as the Mutual Influence of Living Beings[220]

[AS$_{c}$ 679b27-c1] 或復有業。令諸有情展轉增上。由此業力說諸有情更互相望爲增上緣。以彼互有增上力故。亦名共業。是故經言。如是有情與餘有情互相見等。而不受用不易可得。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 102b8-102a1] *yang gang gis sems can rnams*[a] *phan tshun gyi dbang gis byung ba zhes*[b] *brjod pa'i*[c] *sems can rnams kyi phan tshun gyi*[d] *dbang gis 'byung ba'i*[223] *las kyang yod de/ 'di ltar*[e] *sems can gzhan rnams dang*[f] *phan tshun du lta*[g] *ba la sogs pas nye bar*[h] *spyod par mi 'gyur ba'i sems can*[i] *de ni thun mong*[j] *ba ma yin no//*

api khalv asti sattvānām ***anyonyādhipateyaṃ*** *karma/ yenānyonyādhipateyāḥ sattvāḥ proktāḥ/ tathāhi sulabhaḥ* [224] *sa sattvo yasya tad-anyasattvānyonyadarśanādyupabhogo na bhavet/*

And there is also a [kind of] *karman* which consists in the mutual influence[221] of beings, on the basis of which it is said that beings influence [one another] mutually. Because that being is not easily found who would not be delighted (*upabhoga*) by looking at one another with another being[222] and so on.

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *rnams*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *rnams kyi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rnams*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *zhes*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *zhes*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *zhe*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *brjod pa'i*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *brjod pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *brjod pa/*.

[d] AS$_{t,DC}$ *gyi*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *gyis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gyi*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *'di ltar*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *'di ltar gang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'di ltar gang*.

[f] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gzhan rnams dang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de las gzhan pa'i sems can rnams kyi gzugs la*.

[g] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *lta*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *lta*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *blta*.

[h] AS$_{t,DC}$ *pas nye bar*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pas nyes par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'i longs*.

[i] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba'i sems can*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba*.

[j] *rnyed par sla*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *thun mong*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *mong*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rnyed par sla*.

[ASBh 67,6] "Mutual Influence": Explanation[225]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 59b8-60a1] *phan tshun gyi dbang gis*[a] *byung ba yang thun mong ba'i*[b][226] *las su rig par bya ste/ de'i dbang gis sems can rnams phan tshun du sems dang sems las byung ba 'byung ba'i*[227] *rgyur 'gyur ro//*

[ASBh 67,6-7] [§ 70(A)] ***anyonyādhipateyam*** *api karma sādhāraṇaṃ veditavyaṃ yadvaśāt sattvā anyonyaṃ cittacaittapariṇāmanimittaṃ bhavantīti//*

Also the *karman* which consists in mutual influence is to be understood as common–through which living beings mutually become the cause for the transformation of [each other's] thoughts and secondary mental factors.[228]

[AS 55,16-18] Strong *Karman*: A Person With Strong Antidote Can Weaken the Effect of *Karman*[229]

[AS$_c$ 679c1-4] 云何強力業。謂對治力強補特伽羅。故思所造諸不[c]善業。由對治力所攝伏故。令當受那落迦業轉成現法受。應現法受業轉令不受。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 103a1-3] *stobs dang ldan pa'i las gang zhe na*[d]*/ gnyen po'i stobs can gyi gang zag gi*[e] *sems pa las gyur pa'i las mi dge ba gang yin pa de ni/ gnyen po'i stobs bskyed pas/ gang sems can dmyal ba*[f] *myong bar 'gyur ba de mthong ba'i chos la myong bar 'gyur ba 'am/ gang mthong ba'i chos la myong bar 'gyur ba de myong bar mi 'gyur ba ste/*

balavat *karma katamat/* ***pratipakṣabalikasya*** *pudgalasya yat saṃcetanīyam* ***akuśalaṃ*** *karma tat pratipakṣabalādhānena*[230] *yan narakavedanīyaṃ tad dṛṣṭadharmavedanīyaṃ bhavati,*[231] *yad vā dṛṣṭadharmavedanīyaṃ tad avedanīyam bhavati/*

What is strong *karman*? Any intentional unwholesome *karman* [the result of which] is to be experienced in the hells [and which belongs to] a person in whom the antidote is strong, is [then] to be experienced in this life because the antidote gains strength. And [the result of unwholesome *karman*] which is to be experienced in this life is not to be experienced [at all].

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *gis*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *gi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gis*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *mong ba'i*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *mongs pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *mong*.

[c] AS$_c$ 諸不; AS$_c$ (明 ed.) 不諸.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gis*.

[f] AS$_{t,PGDC}$ *ba*; AS$_{t,N}$ bar. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba*.

[ASBh 67,8-9] Explanation: The *Karman* of the Antidote is Stronger

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60a1-2] *mi mthun pa'i phyogs kyi las bas*[a] *ni gnyen po'i las stobs*[b] *dang ldan par blta*[c] *ste/ mi mthun pa'i phyogs kyis 'bras bu 'phangs su zin kyang gnyen po'i stobs kyis gzhan du bsgyur ba'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 67,8-9] [§70B] *vaipakṣikāt karmaṇaḥ* ***prātipakṣikaṃ karma balava****d draṣṭavyam,*[d] *pratipakṣa balenākṣiptasyāpi vipakṣa-phalasyānyathātvāpādanāt/*

The *karman* of the antidote is to be regarded as stronger than the adversary *karman*. Because the fruit of the adversary [*karman*]–even if it is already entailed–is changed (*anyathā-tvāpādana*) through the power of the antidote.

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *las bas*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *las*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *las pas*. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *las*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *stobs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *stobs can gyi gnyen po'i las stobs*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *blta*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *blta bar bya*.

[d] ASBh$_{T}$ *bala[va]d draṣṭavyam*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *baladraṣṭavyam*.

[AS 55,18-19] *Karman* from the Antidote and Intentional Wholesome *Karman* are Strong

[AS$_c$ 679c4-6] 所以此業名強力者。由能對治業力強故。又故思所造一切善業皆名強力。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 103a3] *de ltar na*[a] *gnyen po las byung*[b] *ba'i las dang/ sems pa las gyur pa'i*[c] *dge ba'i las thams cad kyang stobs dang ldan pa'o*[d]*//*

yena[232] ***prātipakṣikaṃ karma sarvaṃ ca kuśalaṃ karma saṃcetanīyaṃ balavat/***

Therefore, [in the case of such a person] the *karman* of the antidote and [also] all intentional wholesome *karman*, [are] strong.

[ASBh 67,9-10] With a Strong Antidote, Intentional Wholesome *Karman* is Stronger

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60a2] *gnyen po'i stobs can gyi dge ba'i las sems pa las gyur pa*[e] *ni/ mi dge ba bas*[f] *stobs dang ldan par blta'o//*[233]

[ASBh 67,9-10] ***sarvaṃ ca kuśalaṃ karma saṃcetanīyaṃ*** *pratipakṣabalikasyākuśalād*[g] [234] ***balavad*** *draṣṭavyam/*

Moreover all intentional wholesome *karman*–of [a person] in whom the antidote is strong–is to be regarded as stronger than the unwholesome [*karman*].

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ltar na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ltar*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNDC}$ *byung*; AS$_{t,G}$ *ma byung*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *byung*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gyur pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *byung ba'i*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *par blta bar bya'o*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gyur pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gyur pa*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *byung ba*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *ba bas*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *bas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *ba bas*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *ba las*.

[g] ASBh$_T$ *pratipakṣabalikasyākuśalād*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *pratipakṣabalikasyākuśalasyālabdhaṃ* (?). ASBh 67, n. 2: "Ms. has additional *syālabdhaṃ*."

[AS 55,19-22] Sūtra Quotation: The Keen Śrāvaka is not Under the Sway of *Karman*[235]

[AS$_{c}$ 679c6-9] 依此業[a]故薄伽梵說。我聖弟子能以無量廣大之業善熏其心。諸所造作有量之業。不能牽引不能留住。亦不能令墮在彼數。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 103a4-5] *'di la*[b] *dgongs nas bcom ldan 'das kyis 'phags pa*[c] *nyan thos sems shin tu bsgoms pas*[d] *tshad med pa*[e] *rgya che ba la/ gang tshad du byas pa'i las des*[f] *khrid par mi byed do// de la*[g] *gnas par mi byed do*[h]*// des de bgrang*[i] *bar mi 'gyur*[j] *zhes gsungs so//*

etat saṃdhāyoktaṃ bhagavatā / āryaśrāvakasya subhāvitāpramāṇavipulacittasya[236] *yat pramāṇakṛtaṃ karma, na sa tena nīyate, na tat tatrāvastiṣṭhate,*[237] *na sa tena saṃkhyāṃ gacchatīti/*

Thinking of this, the Sublime One said "[As for] the *karman* which has been done to a limited [extent] by the Noble Hearer, whose mind is well-cultivated, limitless and vast: he is not lead by that [*karman*], it does not stay with him, he will not be counted [as belonging to a specific destination] through it."

---

[a] AS$_{c}$ 業. Cf. AS$_{c}$ (中華: 石 ed.) 義.

[b] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *la*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *las*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *la*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'i*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pas*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pas*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pa*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *pas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[f] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *des*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *des de*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *des de*.

[g] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *de la*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *de la de dag*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de la de*.

[h] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *byed do*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *bya'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *byed do*.

[i] AS$_{t,PDGC}$ *bgrang*; AS$_{t,N}$ *'grang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bgrang*.

[j] AS$_{t,P}$ *'gyur*; AS$_{t,NGDC}$ *'gyur ro*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'gyur ro*.

[AS 55,22-56,3] Sūtra Quotation: With a Weak Antidote, Unwholesome *Karman* is Stronger

[AS$_c$ 679c9-13] 又對治力劣補特伽羅。故思所造諸不善業。望諸善業皆名強力。又故思造業異熟決定不斷不知。名強力業。此中意說。一切善不善業異熟決定。聖道力不斷者。皆名強力業。[238]

[AS$_{t,P}$ 103a5-6] *gnyen po'i*[a] *mthu chung ba'i gang zag gi*[b] *sems pa las gyur pa'i las mi dge ba gang yin pa*[c] *dang/ gang yang sems pa las gyur pa'i las*[d] *rnam par smin par nges pa de ma spangs pa dang yongs su ma shes pa de ni/ stobs dang ldan pa yin te/ 'di ni 'dir*[e] *dgongs pa'o//*

yad api ***pratipakṣadurbalasya*** *pudgalasya saṃcetanīyaṃ* ***kuśalaṃ*** *karma yac ca* ***niyatavipākam saṃcetanīyaṃ karma aprahīṇaṃ aparijñātam*** *tad* ***balavat/*** *ayam atrābhisaṃdhiḥ/*

"Moreover the intentional unwholesome *karman* of a person in whom the antidote is weak and [his] intentional *karman* which will certainly ripen – [provided that it] has not been given up and has not been completely understood[239]–that (i.e. those two kinds of *karman*) is strong. That is intended [by the Sublime One] here."

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gnyen po'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang gnyen po*.

[b] AS$_{t,DC}$ *gi*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *gis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gi*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pa*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *pa de*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa de*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *las*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *las kyi*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$. *'di ni 'dir*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *'di ni mdor*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *'dir ni mdor*.

[ASBh 67,10-12] Explanation: Unwholesome is Stronger when the Antidote is Weak

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60a2-3] *gnyen po'i*[a] *mthu chung ba'i mi dge ba ni dge ba bas stobs dang ldan no// dge*[b] *ba dang mi dge ba rnam par smin par nges pa*[c] *'phags pa'i lam gyis ma spangs pa thams cad ni bye brag med par stobs dang ldan pa zhes bya'o//*

[ASBh 67,10-12] ***pratipakṣa****bala*[d]***durbalasya*** *tv* ***akuśalaṃ*** *kuśalād balavat/ sarvaṃ cāviśeṣeṇa kuśalākuśalaṃ* ***niyatavipākam*** *ārya-mārgeṇā****prahīṇaṃ balavad***[e] *ity ucyate/*

But the unwholesome [*karman*] of [a person] in whom the power of the antidote is weak is stronger than the wholesome. And [in his case] everything–[be it] wholesome [or] unwholesome–that will certainly ripen [if it is also] not abandoned through the Noble Path is called "strong" without difference.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *po'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *po*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *dge*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de dge*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *par*.

[d] ASBh 67, n. 3: "T. & Ch. omit *bala*."

[e] ASBh$_T$ *balavad*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *balavatad*.

[AS 56,3-5] Four Kinds of *Karman* are Strong by Nature: Connected With *Kāmadhātu*, Habits, etc.[240]

[AS_c 679c13-16] 又欲界繫諸不善業性皆是強力[a]。又先所串習名強力業。又依強位名強力業。又不可治者所造諸業名強力業。無涅槃法故。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 103a6-7] *yang 'dod pa dang rab tu ldan pa'i mi dge ba gang yin pa dang gang sngon goms par byas pa dang/ gnas*[b] *la gnas*[c] *pa dang/ yongs su mya ngan las mi 'da' ba'i chos can rnams kyi bsgrub*[d] *tu med pa gang yin pa de ni rang bzhin gyis*[e] *stobs dang ldan pa'o*[f]*//*

api khalu ***kāmapratisaṃyuktam akuśalaṃ yad api pūrvābhyastaṃ yad api padasthaṃ yad apy asādhyam aparinirvāṇadharmakānāṃ*** *tad api* ***prakṛtyā balavat/***

Moreover [four are] strong by nature:[241] unwholesome [*karman*] that is connected with the desire realm; and also what has been done habitually before; [the *karman* that has been done when] standing on [one's] feet;[242] and also [the *karman*] that cannot be cured,[243] belonging to those who are [and will be] without complete nirvana.

---

[a] AS_c 強力; AS_c (宋, 元, 明, 宮 eds.) 強.

[b] $AS_{t,PNDC}$ *gnas*; $AS_{t,G}$ *gan* (end of line). Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *gnas*.

[c] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *gnas*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *gang gnas*.

[d] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *bsgrub*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,P}$ *bsgrub*; $ASVy_{t,D}$ *sgrub*.

[e] $AS_{t,DC}$ *gyis*; $AS_{t,PNG}$ *gyi*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *gyis*.

[f] $AS_{t,PNG}$ *pa'o*; $AS_{t,DC}$ *pa yin no*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *pa'o*.

[ASBh 67,12-16] Four Kinds of Strong *Karman* Strong by Nature: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60a3-6] *'dod pa dang rab tu ldan pa'i*[a] *mi dge ba ni*[b] *rang bzhin gyis stobs dang ldan pa ste/ nyon mongs pa dang nye ba'i nyon mongs pa la sogs pa'i 'khor mang ba'i phyir ro// gang sngon*[c] *goms par byas pa*[d] *de yang stobs dang ldan pa ste/ des rgyud la*[e] *bsgos pa'i phyir ro// gang gnas la gnas pa ni*[f] *nar son pa rnams kyi ste*[g]*/ mngon par zhen pa dang dad pa drag pos*[h] *byed pa'i phyir ro// yongs su mya ngan las mi 'da' ba'i chos can rnams kyi lam*[i] *sgrub du med pa gang yin pa de ni*[j] *gnyen pos dbyung*[k] *du med pa'i phyir ro//*

Unwholesome [*karman*] that is connected with the desire realm is strong by nature. Because is has a huge following of defilements, secondary defilements and so on. [244] What has been done habitually before, that is also strong. Because the [mental] continuum is practiced through that. Also [the *karman* that has been done] when standing on

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rab tu ldan pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ldan pa*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *ni*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *nyid*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ni*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *sngon*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *sngon gyi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *sngon*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa dang*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *la*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *las*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dang*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *kyi ste*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *kyis te*.

[h] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pos*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *po*.

[i] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *kyi lam*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *kyi*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *kyis*.

[j] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ni rang bzhin gyis stobs dang ldan pa'o/*.

[k] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *dbyung*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *byung*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *sbyang*.

[ASBh 67,12-16] ***kāmapratisaṃyuktam akuśalaṃ prakṛtyā balavat,*** *kleśopakleśādibahuparivāratvāt/* ***yad api***[a] ***pūrvā***[ASBh$_{MS}$ 60b]***bhyastaṃ*** *tad api balavat/ saṃtates tena bhāvitatvāt/* ***yad api padasthaṃ*** *paripūrṇa*[b] *vayasām*[c] *tīvrābhiniveśaprasādakaraṇāt/* ***yad apy asādhyam aparinirvāṇadharmakāṇām***[d] *pratipakṣeṇānuddhāryatvāt/*

one's feet [is strong]. Because it is done [in] full [possession of] strength with violent intense fixation [or violent] faith. Also [the *karman* that] cannot be cured [is strong, i.e. the *karman* of] those who are [and will always be] without complete nirvana,[245] because [that *karman*] cannot be removed by the antidote.

[AS 56,5-6] Strong *Karman*: Its Field and Its Thought Impulse

[AS$_c$ 679c16-17] 又由田故發強力業。又由心加行故發強力業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 103a7-8] *zhing dang sems kyi mngon par 'du byed pas kyang stobs dang ldan pa'i las su rig par bya'o//*

kṣetrato 'pi cittābhisaṃskārato 'pi balavat karma veditavyam/

Karman can be understood as being strong also from [the point of view of its] field as well as from [the point of view of its] thought impulse.[246]

[a] ASBh$_{MS}$ *yad api*; ASBh$_T$ *yadyapi*.

[b] ASBh 67, n. 4: "Ms. *rṇaṃ*."

[c] ASBh$_T$ *paripūrṇavyavasām*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *paripūrṇaṃvayarsaṃ* (?).

[d] ASBh$_T$ *asādhyam aparinirvāṇadharmakāṇām*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *asādhyama/ paparinirvāṇadharmakāṇām*.

[ASBh 67,16-17] Field and Thought Impulse of Strong *Karman*: Explanation[247]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60a6-7] *zhing ni*[a] *ma gsod*[b] *pa la sogs pa'o// sems kyi mngon par 'du byed pa ni byang chub chen por smon lam btab pa*[c] *la sogs pa ste/ stobs dang ldan pa'i las su rig par bya'o//*

[ASBh 67,16-17] ***kṣetrato 'pi*** *mātṛvadhādikam/* ***cittābhisaṃskārato 'pi*** *mahābodhipraṇidhānādikaṃ* ***balavat karma veditavyam//***

Karman can be understood as strong from [the point of view of its] field, [as in the case of] matricide and so on; as well as from [the point of view of its] thought impulse, [as in the case of an] earnest wish for the Great Awakening and so on.

[AS 56,6-8] Nine Aspects of Strong *Karman*

[AS$_c$ 679c17-19] 又由九種因發強力業。謂由田故事故自體故所依故作意故意樂故助伴故多修習故與多衆生共所行故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 103a8-b1] *yang rnam pa dgus stobs dang ldan pa'i las su rig par bya ste/ zhing dang dngos po dang ngo bo nyid dang/ gzhi po*[d] *dang yid la byed pa dang/ bsam pa dang grogs dang/ lan mang du byed pa dang/ skye bo mang pos kyang stobs dang ldan pa ste/*

api khalu ***navabhir ākārair balavat karma veditavyam/ kṣetrato vastutaḥ svabhāvata āśrayato manasikārata āśayataḥ sahāyato bahulīkārato bāhujanyatataś*** *ca//*

Moreover, *karman* can also be understood as strong in terms of nine aspects. From [the point of view of its] field, object, nature, basis, attention, disposition, companion, frequent performance and connection with many people.

---

a ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dang*.

b ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *gsod*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *bsod*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gsod*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *bsod*.

c ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *lam btab pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

d AS$_{t,DC}$ *gzhi po*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bzhi po*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gnas*.

[ASBh 67,17-18] Nine Aspects of Strong *Karman*: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60a7] *yang rnam pa dgus stobs dang ldan pa'i las su rig par bya ste*[a]/ *'di lta ste/*

[ASBh 67,17-18] ***punar nava***[b] ***bhir***[c] ***ākārair balavat karma veditavyam/*** *tadyathā*

Karman can also be understood as strong in terms of nine aspects. [They are] as follows:

[ASBh 67,18] Strong *Karman*: Its Field

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60a7] *zhing ni gal te yon tan dang ldan pa'i sbyin gnas zhing du gyur pa'o//*

[ASBh 67,18] [§70(B,i)] ***kṣetrato*** *yadi guṇavad dakṣiṇīyaṃ kṣetraṃ bhavati/*

From [the point of view of its] field: If [something] endowed with good qualities, worthy of offerings is the field (i.e. recipient).

[ASBh 67,18-19] Strong *Karman*: Its Object[248]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60a7-8] *dngos po ni gal te sbyin pa'i dngos po gya nom zhing mang por*[d] *gyur pa'o//*

[ASBh 67,18-19] [§70(B,ii)] ***vastuto*** *yadi praṇītaṃ prabhūtaṃ deyavastu bhavati/*

From [the point of view of its] object: If [something] excellent, or abundant is the object to be given.

[ASBh 67,19] Strong *Karman*: Its Nature

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60a8] *ngo bo nyid ni sbyin pa bas tshul khrims stobs dang ldan no// tshul khrims pas bsgom pa'o zhes bya ba la sogs pa'o//*

[ASBh 67,19] [§70(B,iii)] ***svabhāvato*** *dānāc chīlaṃ śīlād bhāvanety evamādiḥ/*

From [the point of view of its] nature: discipline[249] is [stronger] than a donation; practice (*bhāvanā*) is [stronger] than discipline, and so on.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yang rnam pa dgus stobs dang ldan pa'i las su rig par bya ste.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rnam pa dgu po de rnams ni stobs dang ldan pa'i las te.*

[b] ASBh 67, n. 5: "Ms. *vā*."

[c] ASBh$_T$ *navabhir*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *navābhir.*

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *por*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *po.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bar.*

[ASBh 67,20] Strong *Karman*: Its Basis

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60a8-b1] *gzhi*[a] *ni bsod nams byed pa gal te 'dod chags dang bral bar gyur pa'o//*

[ASBh 67,20] [§70(B,iv)] ***āśrayataḥ*** *puṇyānāṃ kartā yadi vītarāgo bhavati/*

From [the point of view of its] basis: if the one who is doing meritorious [deeds] is free from passion.

[ASBh 67,20-21] Strong *Karman*: Its Attention

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60b1] *yid la byed pa ni gal te yid la byed pa dang ba*[b] *drag po dang ldan par gyur*[c] *pa'o//*

[ASBh 67,20-21] [§70(B,v)] ***manasikārato***[d] *yadi tīvraprasādasahagato manaskāro bhavati*

From [the point of view of its] attention:[250] if the attention is associated with violent faith.

[ASBh 67,21-22] Strong *Karman*: Its Disposition

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60b1] *bsam pa ni mya ngan las 'das pa'i bsam pa dang ldan par*[e] *gyur ro*[f]*//*

[ASBh 67,21-22] [§70(B,vi)] ***āśayato*** *yadi nirvāṇāśayo bhavati/*

From [the point of view of its] disposition: if the disposition [is to attain] *nirvāṇa*.

[ASBh 67,22] Strong *Karman*: Its Companion

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60b1-2] *grogs ni de las gzhan pa'i bsod nams bya ba'i dngos pos yongs su zin par gyur pa'o//*

[ASBh 67,22] [§70(B,vii)] ***sahāyato*** *yadi tadanya-puṇyakriyavastuparigṛhītaṃ bhavati/*

From [the point of view of its] companion: if it is accompanied by another object for meritorious deeds.[251]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gzhi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gnas*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *dang ba*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *dad pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dad pa*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *gyur pa'o*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *'gyur pa'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gyur pa'o*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *'gyur ro*.

[d] ASBh$_{MS}$ *manasikārato*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *manaskārato*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa dang ldan par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *par*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *ro*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *pa'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'o*.

[ASBh 67,23] Strong *Karman*: Its Frequent Performance

[$ASBh_{t,P}$ 60b2] *lan mang du byed pa ni yang dang yang du byas par gyur pa'am rjes su rnam par brtags pa'o//*

[ASBh 67,23] [§70(B,viii)] ***bahulīkārato***[a] *yadi paunaḥpunye*[b] *na*[c] *kṛtaṃ bhavaty anuvitarkitaṃ vā/*

From [the point of view of its] frequent performance: If it has been done or reconsidered again and again.

[a] *bahulīkārato*; $ASBh_{T,MS}$ *bahulīkārataḥ*.

[b] ASBh 67, n. 6: "Ms. *nye.*"

[c] $ASBh_T$ *paunaḥpunyena*; $ASBh_{MS}$ *paunaḥpunyeṇa*.

[ASBh 67,24] Strong *Karman*: Its Connection With Many People

[$ASBh_{t,P}$ 60b2-3] *skye bo*[a] *mang pos kyang zhes bya ba ni bdag gis kyang byas par gyur la gzhan dag kyang byed du bcug pa'o//*

[ASBh 67,24] [§70(B,ix)] ***bāhujanyato*** *yadi svayaṃ ca kṛtaṃ bhavaty anyaiś ca kāritam iti//*

From [the point of view of its] connection with many people: If one has both done it oneself and caused others to do it.

[AS 56,8] The Opposite of Strong *Karman*: Weak *Karman*[252]

[AS_c 679c19] 與此相違是劣力。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 103b1] *'di*[b] *las bzlog pa ni stobs dang mi ldan pa'i las*[c] *so//*

etadviparyayeṇa durbalaṃ karma

Weak *karman* is [to be understood] as the opposite of that.

---

[a] $ASBh_{t,NGDC}$ *bo*; $ASBh_{t,P}$ *ba*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *bo*.

[b] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *'di*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *de*.

[c] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *las*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,D}$ *las*; $ASVy_{t,P}$ *las las*.

[AS 56,9-11] Sūtra Quotation: Action and Result are not Necessarily Similar[253]

[AS$_c$ 679c20-24] 業如世尊說。若有說言。彼彼丈夫補特伽羅。隨如是如是業。若作若增長還受如是如是異熟。若有是事便不應修清淨梵行。亦不可知正盡諸苦作苦邊際。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 103b1-3] *bcom ldan 'das kyis su zhig 'di skad du skyes bu gang zag 'di ji lta ji ltar las byed cing sogs*[a] *pa de lta de ltar rnam par smin pa myong bar 'gyur na/ de lta*[b] *na tshangs par spyod par*[c] *gnas par mi 'gyur zhing yang dag par sdug bsngal zad pa*[d] *dang sdug bsngal mthar dbyung ba'i skabs kyang mi snang ngo zhes zer ba dang/*

yad uktaṃ bhagavatā/ ***ya evaṃ vaded, yathā yathāyaṃ puruṣapudgalaḥ karma karoty upacinoti tathā tathā vipākaṃ pratisaṃvedayata ity, evaṃ sati brahmacaryavāso na bhavaty avakāśaś ca na prajñāyate samyagduḥkha-kṣayāya duḥkhasyāntakriyāyai/***

The Sublime One said: "If someone were to assert: 'In whichever way this person has done and heaped up *karman*, in [exactly] that way will he experience [its] ripening,' then one would not live the life of an ascetic (*brahmacarya*),[254] and no occasion would be known for the right extinction of suffering, for bringing an end to suffering".[255]

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *sogs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *sogs*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *sog*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNDG}$ *lta*; AS$_{t,C}$ *l+* (illegible). Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ltar*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa la*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *par mi 'gyur ba*.

[ASBh 67,25-68,1] If Action and Result were Similar, Celibacy Would not be Conducive to Liberation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60b3-4] *su zhig 'di skad du skyes bu gang zag 'di ji lta*[a] *ji ltar las byed cing sogs*[b] *pa de lta*[c] *de ltar rnam par smin pa myong bar 'gyur*[d] *na/ de ltar na tshangs par spyod pas gnas par mi 'gyur zhing yang dag par sdug bsngal zad pa dang/ sdug bsngal mthar dbyung ba'i skabs kyang mi snang ngo zhes zer ba*[e] *zhes bya ba la/*

[ASBh 67,25-68,1] [§71] ***ya evaṃ vaded,***[f] ***yathā yathāyaṃ puruṣapudgalaḥ karma karoty upacinoti tathā tathā vipākaṃ pratisaṃvedayata, ity evaṃ sati brahmacarya***[g] ***vāso na bhavaty avakā***[ASBh$_{MS}$ 61a]***śaś ca na prajñāyate samyagduḥkhakṣayāya duḥkhasyāntakriyāyai/***

[The sūtra states:] "If someone were to assert: 'In whichever way this person has done and heaped up *karman*, in [exactly] that way will he experience [its] ripening,' then one would not live the life of an ascetic, and no occasion would be known for the right extinction of suffering, for bringing an end to suffering".

[ASBh 68,1-2] Question: Why Rejection of Asceticism?

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60b4-5] *ji ltar byas na tshangs par spyod pas*[h] *gnas par mi 'gyur zhe na/*

[ASBh 68,1-2] *kathaṃ kṛtvā brahmacaryavāso na bhavati/*

With which intention [did the Sublime One say] that one would not live the life of an ascetic?

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *lta*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *ltar*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *sogs*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *stsogs*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *lta*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *ltar*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *'gyur*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *gyur*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *zer ba*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *zer*.

[f] ASBh$_{MS}$ *vaded*; ASBh$_{T}$ *vadet*.

[g] ASBh 67, n. 7: "Ms. *bhā*."

[h] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *pa*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *par*.

[ASBh 68,2-4] Reply: Because Burdensome Discipline Would Lead to an Unpleasant Result

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60b5-6] *nyon mongs pa drag po*[a] *dang ldan pa*[b] *so sor brtags na*[c] *sdug bsngal dang bcas shing yid mi bde ba dang*[d] *bcas par*[e] *tshul khrims yongs su bsrung ba'i*[f] *phyir*[g] *gal te de'i*[h] *rnam par smin pa yang*[i] *de bzhin du sdug bsngal dang bcas shing yid mi bde ba dang bcas pa*[j] *myong na ni de yongs su bsrung ba*[k] *don med par 'gyur ro//*

[ASBh 68,2-4] *tīvrakleśasya pratisaṃkhyāya sahaduḥkhena sahadaurmanasyena śīlaparipālanāt/*[256] *yadi tadvipākas tathaiva sahaduḥkhena sahadaurmanasyenānubhūyeta vṛthā tatparipālanaṃ syāt/*

Because a person whose defilements are violent can observe the discipline [only] while carefully observing [his behaviour] with suffering, with an unhappy mind: if its ripening would be equally experienced with suffering, with an unhappy mind, its observance would be useless.

[ASBh 68,4-6] Reply: Because Joyful Bad Conduct Would Lead to Pleasant Result

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60b6-7] *gzhan gyi chung ma la sogs pa la bde ba dang bcas shing yid bde ba dang bcas par tshul khrims 'chal par*[l] *byas pa'i phyir gal te de'i rnam par smin pa de bzhin du myong na ni de spong ba don med par 'gyur te/ de ltar byas na tshangs par spyod pas gnas par mi 'gyur ro//*

And because those who have intercourse with the wife of another, etc., act out corrupt discipline with joy and a happy mind: if its ripening would be experienced in just the same way,

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNDC}$ *po*; ASBh$_{t,G}$ *pos*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *po*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *pa*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *pas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *pas*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *pa*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *nas*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *dang bcas shing yid mi bde ba dang*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *dang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dang bcas shing yid mi bde ba dang*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *par*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *pa*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bsrung ba'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bsrungs pa'i*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *phyir*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *phyir ro*.

[h] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *te de'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *te*.

[i] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa yang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'ang*.

[j] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *par*.

[k] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *bsrung ba*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *srung ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bsrungs pa*.

[l] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'chal par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *nyams par*.

[ASBh 68,4-6] *pāradārikaprabhṛtīnāṃ ca sahasukhena sahasaumanasyena dauḥśīlya karaṇād [/] yadi tadvipākas tathaivānubhūyeta vṛthā tadviratiḥ*[a] *syād ity evaṃ kṛtvā brahmacaryavāso na bhavati/*

it would be useless to abstain from it. That is why one would not live the life of an ascetic.

[ASBh 68,6] Question: Why Would Liberation Become Impossible?

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60b7-8] *ji ltar na yang dag par sdug bsngal zad pa dang/ sdug bsngal mthar dbyung ba'i skabs kyang mi snang zhe na/*

[ASBh 68,6] *katham avakāśaś ca na prajñāyate samyagduḥkhakṣayāya duḥkhasyāntakriyāyai/*

And how is it that no chance would be known for the right extinction of suffering, for bringing an end to suffering?

[ASBh 68,7] Reply: Because Discipline is the Base for Liberation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60b8] *de'i phyir de'i rgyur gyur pa tshangs par spyod pas gnas pa'i rnam par smin pa sdug bsngal ba'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 68,7] *ata eva tadupaniṣadbhūtasya*[b] *brahmacaryavāsasya duḥkhavipākatvād iti/*

Exactly for the same [reason], because the life of an ascetic that is its causal basis would have suffering as its ripening.

[ASBh 68,7-9] Rejection of the Rule that Action and Result Must be Similar

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 60b8-61a2] *de ltar byas na bde ba dang bcas pa'i las kyi rnam par smin pa*[c] *ni bde ba dang bcas pa nyid du 'gyur/ sdug bsngal dang bcas pa'i rnam par smin pa ni*[d] *sdug bsngal nyid du 'gyur/ sdug bsngal yang ma yin pa*[e] *bde ba yang ma yin pa dang bcas pa'i ni/ sdug bsngal yang ma yin pa*[f] *bde ba yang ma yin pa dang bcas pa nyid du gyur ro zhes bya ba'i nges pa ni 'dir bcom ldan 'das kyis bkag go//*

And with this in mind the rule (*niyama*) has been rejected that the ripening of *karman* associated with pleasure is exclusively (*eva*) associated with pleasure, [that the ripening of *karman*] associated

---

[a] ASBh$_T$ *tadviratiḥ*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *tadvirati.*

[b] ASBh$_{MS}$ *tadupaniṣadbhūtasya* (=Sakuma, *Index*, p. 24); ASBh$_T$ *tadupaniṣadbhatasya.*

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *pa.* ASVy$_{t,D}$ *pas.*

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'i rnam par smin pa ni.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'i.*

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *yin pa* ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *yin.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin.*

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *yin pa* ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *yin.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin.*

[ASBh 68,7-9] evaṃ ca kṛtvā sukhasahagatasya karmaṇaḥ sukhasahagata eva vipāko duḥkhasahagatasya duḥkhasahagato [a] *'duḥkhāsukhasahagatasya tatsahagata eveti niyamaḥ pratiṣiddhaḥ//*

with suffering is [exclusively] associated with suffering, [and that the ripening of *karman*] associated with neither suffering nor pleasure is [exclusively] associated with exactly that.

[AS 56,11-15] Sūtra Quotation: If Action and Result Were Similar, there would be no Liberation

[AS$_c$ 679c23-27] 若有說言。彼彼丈夫補特伽羅。隨如是如是順所受業。若作若增長。還受如是如是順所受異熟。若有是事便應修習清淨梵行。又亦可知正盡諸苦作苦邊際。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 103b3-5] yang su zhig 'di skad du skyes bu gang zag 'di ji lta ji ltar[b] *myong bar 'gyur ba'i las byed cing sogs*[c] *pa de lta de ltar*[d] *rnam par smin pa myong bar 'gyur na*[e]*/ de lta na ni tshangs par spyod pas*[f] *gnas par 'gyur zhing yang dag par sdug bsngal zad par 'gyur ba dang/ sdug bsngal mthar dbyung ba'i skabs kyang snang ngo zhes zer zhes bcom ldan 'das kyis gang gsungs pa de'i*[g] *dgongs pa gang zhe na/*

yas tv evaṃ vaded yathāyathāvedanīyaṃ ayaṃ puruṣapudgalo karma karoty upacinoti tathātathāvedanīyaṃ vipākaṃ pratisaṃvedayata ity, evaṃ sati brahmacaryavaso bhavati, avakāśaś ca prajñāyate samyag duḥkhakṣayāya duḥkhasyāntakriyāyā iti, tatra ko 'bhisaṃdhiḥ/

"But if someone were to assert: 'If a person has done and heaped up *karman* to be experienced in such and such a way, he will experience [its] ripening to be experienced in such and such a way', then one would live the life of an ascetic, and an occasion would be known for the right extinction of suffering, for bringing an end to suffering."

---

[a] ASBh 68, n. 1 (for *duḥkhasahagatasya duḥkhasahagato*): "'*duḥkha ... sahagato*' is in the bottom margin of Ms."

[b] AS$_{t,DC}$ *ji lta ji ltar*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *ji ltar myong bar 'gyur ba ji ltar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ji ltar*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *byed cing sogs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *sog*.

[d] AS$_{t,DC}$ *de lta de ltar*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *de ltar myong bar 'gyur ba'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de ltar myong bar 'gyur ba'i*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba na*.

[f] AS$_{t,DC}$ *pas*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa la*.

[g] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *de'i*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *de la*.

[AS 56,14-16] Explanation: The Buddha Rejects Joyful Result of Joyful Action

[AS$_c$ 679c27-29] 如是經言有何密意。此中佛意爲欲遮止如是邪說。謂樂俱行業。還能感得樂俱行異熟。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 103b5] *'dir bcom ldan 'das kyis*[a] *bde ba dang ldan pa'i las kyi rnam par smin pa bde ba dang ldan pa bkag go//*

atra bhagavatā ***sukhasahagatasya*** *karmaṇaḥ* ***sukhasahagato vipāko*** *pratiṣiddhaḥ/*[257]

Here, the Bhagavat has rejected [the view that] *karman* associated with pleasure has a ripening which is [equally] associated with pleasure

[AS 56,16-18] The Buddha Rejects Unpleasant Result of Unpleasant Action, and so on

[AS$_c$ 679c29-680a2] 苦俱行業。還能感得苦俱行異熟。不苦不樂俱行業。還能感得不苦不樂俱行異熟。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 103b5-6] *sdug*[b] *bsngal dang ldan pa'i sdug bsngal dang ldan pa dang bsdug sngal yang ma yin bde ba yang ma yin pa dang ldan pa'i bsdug sngal yang ma yin bde ba yang ma yin pa dang ldan pa yang de bzhin no/*

evaṃ ***duḥkhasahagatasya duḥkhasahagataḥ/ aduḥkhāsukhasahagatasya*** *aduḥkhāsukhasaha****gataḥ/***

Likewise [the view that *karman*] associated with suffering, has [a ripening that is equally] associated with suffering. And [the view that *karman*] that is associated with neither suffering nor pleasure [has a ripening] that is associated with neither suffering nor pleasure [are equally rejected].

[AS 56,18] *Karman* with Pleasant Ripening to be Experienced as Pleasant

[AS$_c$ 680a2-3] 故作是說。又爲開許如是正說。謂樂俱行業順樂受者。還受樂異熟。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 103b6-7] *yang bde ba dang ldan zhing bde ba myong bar 'gyur ba'i rnam par smin pa bde ba ni gnang ngo//*

sukhasahagatasya *punaḥ* ***sukha****vedanīyasya* ***sukho vipāko*** *'nujñātaḥ/*

[The Sublime One] has however admitted [258] that [*karman*] associated with pleasure that is to be experienced as pleasure has a pleasant ripening,

[a] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *'dir bcom ldan 'das kyis*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *'dir ni bcom ldan 'das kyis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bcom ldan 'das kyi 'dir*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *sdug*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de bzhin du sdug*.

[AS 56,19] The Buddha Accepts Unpleasant Ripening of Unpleasant Results

[AS_c 680a3-4] 順苦受者。還受苦異熟。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 103b7] *sdug bsngal myong bar 'gyur ba'i*[a] *sdug bsngal dang/*

***duḥkha**vedanīyasya duḥkhaḥ/*

that [this kind of *karman* associated with pleasure, if it is] to be experienced as suffering, has a [ripening as] suffering,

[AS 56,19-20] The Buddha Accepts Neither Pleasant nor Unpleasant Ripening of Neither Pleasant nor Unpleasant Results

[AS_c 680a4-5] 順不苦不樂受者。還受不苦不樂異熟。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 103b7-8] *sdug bsngal yang ma yin pa bde ba yang ma yin pa myong bar 'gyur ba'i sdug bsngal yang ma yin pa bde ba yang ma yin pa dang*

***aduḥkhāsukhavedanīyasya** aduḥkhāsukhaḥ/*

and that [this kind of *karman* associated with pleasure, if it is] to be experienced as neither suffering nor pleasure, has neither [its ripening as] suffering nor pleasure.[259]

[AS 56,20-21] The Buddha Accepts Pleasant Ripening also When the Action was Unpleasant

[AS_c 680a5-6] 苦俱行業順樂受者。還受樂異熟。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 103b8] *sdug bsngal dang ldan la bde ba myong bar 'gyur ba'i rnam par smin pa bde ba ni gnang ngo//*

***duḥkha**sahagatasya **sukha**vedanīyasya **sukho vipāko 'nujñāyataḥ**/*

[The Sublime One has likewise] admitted that [*karman*] that is associated with suffering, if it is to be experienced as pleasure, has a pleasurable ripening.

[AS 56,21] Unpleasant Ripening of Unpleasant Results

[AS_c 680a6] 順苦受者。還受苦異熟。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 103b8] *sdug bsngal myong bar 'gyur ba'i sdug bsngal dang/*

duḥkhavedanīyaya duḥkhaḥ/

that [this kind of *karman* associated with suffering if it is] to be experienced as suffering has [a ripening] as suffering,

---

[a] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *'gyur ba'i*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *gyur pa'i*.

[AS 56,21-22] Neither Pleasant nor Unpleasant Ripening of Neither Pleasant nor Unpleasant Results

[AS$_c$ 680a6-7] 順不苦不樂受者。還受不苦不樂異熟。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 103b8-104a1] *sdug bsngal yang ma yin bde ba yang ma yin pa myong bar 'gyur ba'i sdug bsngal yang ma yin bde ba yang ma yin pa dang*

aduḥkhāsukhavedanīyasya aduḥkhāsukhaḥ/

that [this kind of *karman* associated with suffering, if it is] to be experienced as neither suffering nor pleasure, has [a ripening that is] neither suffering nor pleasure,

[AS 56,22-57,1] Pleasant Ripening of Neither Pleasant nor Unpleasant Actions

[AS$_c$ 680a7-8] 不苦不樂俱行業順樂受者。還受樂異熟。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 104a1-2] *sdug bsngal yang ma yin bde ba yang ma yin pa dang ldan la/ bde ba myong bar 'gyur ba'i rnam par smin pa bde ba ni gnang ngo//*

aduḥkhāsukhasahagatasya sukhavedanīyasya sukho vipāko 'nujñātaḥ

[and] that [the *karman*] that is associated with neither suffering nor pleasure to be experienced as pleasure has [a ripening as] pleasure [is] admitted [by the Sublime One].

[AS 57,1] Unpleasant Ripening of Unpleasant Results

[AS$_c$ 680a8-9] 順苦受者。還受苦異熟。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 104a2] *sdug bsngal myong bar 'gyur ba'i sdug bsngal dang/*

duḥkhavedanīyasya duḥkhaḥ,

[That this *karman* associated with neither suffering nor pleasure, if it is] to be experienced as suffering, has [a ripening as] suffering,

[AS 57,1-2] Neither Pleasant nor Unpleasant Ripening of Neither Pleasant nor Unpleasant Results

[AS$_c$ 680a9] 順不苦不樂受者。還受不苦不樂異熟。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 104a2-3] *sdug bsngal yang ma yin bde ba yang ma yin pa myong bar 'gyur ba'i sdug bsngal yang ma yin bde ba yang ma yin pa'o*

aduḥkhāsukhavedanīyasya aduḥkhāsukhaḥ,

that [this *karman* associated with neither suffering nor pleasure if it is] to be experienced as neither suffering nor pleasure, has [a ripening as] neither suffering nor pleasure,

[AS 57,2] (Explanation on Sūtra Quotation Ends)

[AS$_{c}$ 680a10] 如是名爲此經密意。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 104a3] *zhes bya ba 'di ni 'dir dgongs pa'o//*

ayam atrābhisaṃdhiḥ/

that is what is intended here [by the Sublime One].

[ASBh 68,9-12] Explanation: Pleasant Ripening of Wholesome, Unpleasant Ripening of Unwholesome Actions

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 61a2-4] *yang*[a] *su zhig 'di skad du/ skyes bu gang zag 'di ji ltar myong bar 'gyur ba ji ltar myong*[b] *bar 'gyur ba*[c] *zhes bya ba la sogs pas ni bde ba*[d] *dang ldan pa'i dge ba dang/ mi dge ba phyi ma la ji ltar mthun mthun du*[e] *bde ba dang/ sdug bsngal dang/ sdug bsngal yang ma yin pa*[f] *bde ba yang ma yin par*[g] *myong bar 'gyur ba'i*[h] *bde ba la sogs pa'i rnam par smin pa ni gnang ngo//*

[ASBh 68,9-12] *atra* ***ya***[i]***s tv evaṃ*** *[vaded]*[260] ***yathā***[j]***vedanīyaṃ yathāvedanīyam*** *ity evamādinā sukhasahagatasya kuśalākuśalasya yathāyogam āyatyāṃ sukhaduḥkhāsukhāduḥkhavedanīyasya sukhādiko vipāko 'nujñātaḥ/*

Here, through [the statement] "But if someone [said]: 'If [a person has committed and heaped up *karman*] to be experienced in such a way [or] to be experienced in such a way'", and so on, [the Sublime One] has admitted the future pleasurable, etc. (i.e. painful or beyond) ripening of wholesome and unwholesome [*karman*] that is associated with pleasure [which is] to be experienced as pleasure, suffering, [or] neither pleasure nor suffering, as appropriate (i.e. as to whether it was wholesome or unwholesome).

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *yang*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *yongs*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGC}$ *myong*; ASBh$_{t,D}$ *myang*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *'gyur ba*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *'gyur*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *bde ba*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *'de 'a*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *mthun mthun du*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rigs par*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *yin pa*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *yin*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *yin par*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *yin*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin pa*.

[h] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba'i rnam par smin pa*.

[i] ASBh 68, n. 2: "T. *puruṣapudgalasya*."

[j] *evaṃ [vaded] yathā*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *evaṃdya*(or *mya*?)*thā* ; ASBh$_{T}$ *evaṃ yathā*.

[ASBh 68,12-13] *Karman* to be Experienced as Pleasure Ripens as Pleasure

--[261]

[ASBh 68,12-13] *evaṃ duḥkhāduḥkhāsukha-sahagatasya sukhādive*[ASBh_{MS} 61b]*danīyasya sukhādiko vipāko 'nujñāta*[a] *iti*[b]//

Likewise it is admitted that the ripening of [*karman*] that is associated with suffering, or with neither suffering nor pleasure, is [according to whether it is] to be experienced as pleasure, and so on, is pleasant, and so on.

[AS 57,3] Restraint, Non-Restraint and Neither-Restraint-Nor-Non-Restraint

[AS_{c} 680a10-11] 又業差別有三種。謂律儀業。不律儀業。非律儀非不律儀業。

[$\text{AS}_{\text{t,P}}$ 104a3] *las kyi rab tu dbye ba ni sdom pa'i las dang/ sdom pa ma yin pa'i las dang/ sdom pa yang ma yin sdom pa ma yin pa yang ma yin pa'i las so//*

karmaprabhedas[264] *saṃvarakarmāsaṃvarakarma naivasaṃvaranāsaṃvarakarma ca/ saṃvara*

The classification of *karman* is (a.) *karman* that is restraint,[262] (b.) *karman* that is non-restraint,[263] (c.) *karman* that is neither restraint, nor non-restraint.

[AS 57,4-5] *Karman* that is Restraint[265]

[AS_{c} 680a12-13] 云何律儀業。謂別解脫律儀所攝業。靜慮律儀所攝業。無漏律儀所攝業。

[$\text{AS}_{\text{t,P}}$ 104a4] *sdom pa'i las gang zhe na*[c]*/ so sor*[d] *thar pa'i sdom pas bsdus pa dang/ bsam gtan gyi sdom pas bsdus pa dang/ zag pa med pa'i sdom pas bsdus pa'o//*

saṃvarakarma katamat/ prātimokṣasaṃvarasaṃgṛhītaṃ dhyānasaṃvarasaṃgṛhītaṃ anāsrava-saṃvarasaṃgṛhītaṃ ca/

What is the *karman* that is restraint? It is (a.) condensed in the *prātimokṣa* restraints, (b.) condensed in the restraints of absorption and (c.) condensed in the restraints without inflow.

---

[a] *[a]nujñāta*; ASBh_{T} *[a]nujñāyata*; ASBh_{MS} *[a]nujñāyata* (with elision mark above *ya*)

[b] ASBh 68, n. 3 (for *evaṃ ... iti*): "T. drops '*evaṃ ... iti*', but Ch. has it."

[c] $\text{AS}_{\text{t,PNGDC}}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. $\text{ASVy}_{\text{t,PD}}$ *gang*.

[d] $\text{AS}_{\text{t,DC}}$ *sor*; $\text{AS}_{\text{t,PNG}}$ *so*. Cf. $\text{ASVy}_{\text{t,D}}$ *sor*. $\text{ASVy}_{\text{t,P}}$ *so*.

[AS 57,5-7] *Karman* of the Restraints for Individual Liberation, Eight Kinds

[AS$_c$ 680a13-17] 別解脫律儀所攝業者。即是七衆所受律儀。謂苾芻律儀。苾芻尼律儀。式叉[a]摩那律儀。勤策律儀。勤策女律儀。鄔波索迦律儀。鄔波斯迦律儀。及近住律儀。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 104a4-6] *so sor*[b] *thar pa'i sdom pas bsdus pa'i*[c] *las gang zhe na/ ris brgyad de/ dge slong gi sdom pa dang/ dge slong ma'i sdom pa dang/ dge slob ma'i sdom pa dang/ dge tshul gyi sdom pa dang/ dge tshul ma'i sdom pa dang/ dge bsnyen gyi sdom pa dang/ dge bsnyen ma'i sdom pa dang/ bsnyen gnas kyi*[d] *sdom pa'o//*

prātimokṣasaṃvarasaṃgṛhītaṃ karma katamat/ aṣṭau nikāyāḥ/ bhikṣusaṃvaro bhikṣuṇīsaṃvaraḥ śikṣamāṇāsaṃvaraḥ śrāmaṇerasaṃvaraḥ śrāmaṇerīsaṃvara upāsakasaṃvara upāsikāsaṃvara upavāsasaṃvaraś ca//

What is the *karman* condensed in the *prātimokṣa* restraints? There are eight kinds: (1.) the restraints of a fully ordained monk, (2.) the restraints of a fully ordained nun, (3.) the restraints of a trainee nun, (4.) the restraints of a novice monk, (5.) the restraints of a novice nun, (6.) the restraints of a male lay follower, (7.) the restraints of a female lay follower, 8.) the fasting restraints.[266]

[a] AS$_c$ 叉; AS$_c$ (明 ed.) 叉.

[b] AS$_{t,DC}$ *sor*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *so*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *sor*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *so*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pas bsdus pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'i*.

[d] *kyi*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *gyi*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'i*.

[AS 57,7-8] The Subject of the Restraints: Abstains from Bad Conduct and Desire

[AS$_c$ 680a17-18] 依止何等補特伽羅建立出家律儀。依能修行遠離惡行。遠離欲行補特[a]伽羅。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 104a6-7] *rab tu byung ba'i sdom pa gang zag ji lta bu'i dbang du byas te rnam par gzhag ce na*[b]*/ nyes par spyod pa las dben par*[c] *spyod pa dang/ 'dod pa las dben par spyod pa'o*[d]*//*

kīdṛśaṃ ***pudgalam adhikṛtya pravrajitasaṃvaro vyavasthāpitaḥ/ duścaritavivekacaritaṃ kāma-vivekacaritaṃ*** *ca/*

With regard to what kind of person has the restraint of the renunciate been established? [With regard to someone] whose conduct is [characterized by] keeping aloof from bad conduct and whose conduct is [likewise characterized by] keeping aloof from sensual pleasure.[267]

[ASBh 68,14-15] The Five Kinds of Restraints for Ordination

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 61a4-5] *rab tu byung ba'i sdom pa ni rnam pa lnga ste/ dge slong gi*[e] *sdom pa nas dge tshul ma'i*[f] *sdom pa'i bar du'o//*

[ASBh 68,14-15] [§72A(i)] ***pravrajita****sya* ***saṃvaraḥ*** *pañcavidho bhikṣusaṃvaro yāvac chrāmaṇerīsaṃvara*[g] *iti/*

There are five kinds of restraint for a renunciate, from the restraint of a fully ordained monk to the restraint of a novice nun.

---

[a] AS$_c$ 特; AS$_c$ (宋, 元 eds.) 持.

[b] AS$_{t,DC}$ *gzhag ce na*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bzhag ce na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gzhag*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bzhag*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGD}$ *par*; AS$_{t,C}$ *pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *par*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *pa'o*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *pa dang*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gi*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *ma'i*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ma'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *ma'i*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gyi*.

[g] ASBh$_{MS}$ *chrāmaṇerīsaṃvara*; ASBh$_{T}$ *chāmaṇerīsaṃvara*.

[ASBh 68,15-17] The Monastic Restraints are for Those Who Abstain from Bad Conduct and Desire

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 61a5-6] *nyes par spyod pa las dben par spyod pa dang/ 'dod pa las dben par spyod pa zhes bya ba ni*[a] *gang zag gi dbang du byas nas rnam par gzhag*[b] *pa ste/ 'di ltar*[c] *de 'dra ba de ni ji srid 'tsho'i bar du srog gcod*[d] *pa la sogs pa nyes par spyod pa dang/ mi tshangs par spyod pa spong*[e] *bar nus so*[f]*//*

[ASBh 68,15-17] *sa* ***duścaritavivekacaritaṃ kāmavivekacaritaṃ*** *ca* ***pudgalam adhikṛtya vyavasthāpitaḥ****/ tathā hi sa tādṛśaḥ śaknoti yāvajjīvaṃ*[g] *praṇātipātā[diduścarita]d a*[h]*brahmacaryāc ca virantum iti/*

It has been established with regard to a person whose conduct is [characterized by] keeping aloof from bad conduct and whose conduct is [characterized by] keeping aloof from desire. For such [a person] is able to abstain [both] from bad conduct such as killing and unchastity for as long as he lives.

[AS 57,9-10] The Subject of the Lay Restraints

[AS$_c$ 680a18-21] 依止何等補特伽羅建立鄔波索迦律儀鄔波斯迦律儀。依能盡受遠離惡行。不遠離欲行補特伽羅。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 104a7-8] *dge bsnyen dang dge bsnyen ma'i sdom pa gang zag ji lta bu'i dbang du byas te rnam par gzhag ce na*[a]*/ nyes par spyod pa las dben par spyod pa yin gyi/ 'dod pa las dben par spyod pa*[b] *ma yin no//*

With regard to what kind of person has the restraint of the male or female lay follower been established? [With regard to someone whose] conduct is [characterized by] keeping aloof from bad conduct, but whose

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa zhes bya ba ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'i*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *gzhag*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *bzhag*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gzhag*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bzhag* (corrected from *gzhag*).

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ltar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *lta*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *gcod*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *gcad*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gcod*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *spong*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *spang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *spong*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bar nus so*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba'i phyir ro*.

[g] ASBh$_T$ *yāvajjīvaṃ*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *yāvajjīvituṃ*. ASBh 68, n. 4: "Ms. °*jīvituṃ* for *jītraṃ*" (the latter seems to be a misprint for *jīvaṃ*).

[h] ASBh 68, n. 5: "Ms. *ya*. T. and Ch. *prāṇātipātādiduścaritāda*°."

kīdṛśaṃ pudgalam ***adhikṛtya upāsakopāsikāsaṃvaro vyavasthāpitaḥ/ duścaritavivekacaritam na tu kāmavivekacaritam//***

conduct is not separated from sensual pleasure.

[ASBh 68,17-18] The Lay Restraints are for Those Who Abstain from Bad Conduct but not from Desire

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 61a6-7] *dge bsnyen dang dge bsnyen ma'i sdom pa ni nyes par spyod pa las dben par spyod pa'i dbang du byas pa ste/ 'dod pa las dben par spyod pa ni ma yin no// de bas na 'di'i sdom pa*[c] *ji srid 'tsho'i bar du 'dod pa la log*[d] *par g.yem pa spong bar*[e] *rnam par gzhag*[f] *gi// mi tshangs par spyod pa spong*[g] *ba ni ma yin no//*

[ASBh 68,17-19] ***upāsakopāsikāsaṃvaro duścaritavivekacaritam adhikṛtya no tu kāmavivekacaritam/*** *ata*[h] *evāsya yāvajjīvaṃ kāmamithyācāraviratir vyāvasthāpyate/ nābrahmacaryaviratir iti/*

The restraint of a male or female lay follower [has been established] with regard to [a person whose] conduct is [characterized by] keeping aloof from bad conduct, but whose conduct is not [characterized by] keeping aloof from sensual pleasure. That is exactly why for this [kind of person] the abstention from sexual misconduct for as long as he lives has been established but not the abstention from unchastity.

---

[a] AS$_{t,DC}$ *gzhag ce na*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bzhag ce na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gzhag*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bzhag*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pa*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *pa ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *pa ni*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *pa na*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *pa*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *pa ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa ni*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNDC}$ *log*; ASBh$_{t,G}$ *logs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *log*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bar*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *ba*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *gzhag*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *bzhag*; Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gzhag*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bzhag*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *spong ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *spang ba*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *spangs pa*.

[h] ASBh$_{MS}$ *ata*; ASBh$_{T}$ *ataḥ*.

[AS 57,10-11] The Fasting Restraints are for Those Who Abstain from Neither Bad Conduct nor Desire

[AS_c 680a21-23] 依止何等補特伽羅建立近住律儀。依止不能遠離惡行及不能遠離欲行補特[a]伽羅。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 104a8] *bsnyen gnas pa'i sdom pa gang zag ji lta bu'i dbang du byas te rnam par gzhag ce na*[b]*/ nyes par spyod pa las dben par spyod pa yang ma yin/ 'dod pa las dben par spyod pa yang ma yin pa'o//*

*kīdṛśaṃ pudgalam adhikṛty**opavāsasaṃvaro** vyavasthāpitaḥ/* ***naiva duścaritavivekacaritaṃ na kāmavivekacaritam/***

With regard to what kind of person is the fasting restraint established? [With regard to someone whose] conduct is neither [characterized by] keeping aloof from bad conduct, nor from sensual pleasure.

[ASBh 68,19-20] The Fasting Restraints: Explanation

[$ASBh_{t,P}$ 61a7-b1] *bsnyen gnas pa'i sdom pa ni nyes par spyod pa las dben par spyod ba yang ma yin 'dod pa las dben par spyod pa yang*[c] *ma yin pa ste/ de'i phyir de'i sdom pa ni nyin zhag gcig pa la*[d] *bsnyen gnas pa'i sdom par btags*[e][268] *te/ rim gyis de gnyi ga goms*[f] *par bya ba'i*[g] *phyir ro//*

[ASBh 68,19-21] ***upavāsasaṃvaro naiva duścarita vivekacaritaṃ na kāmavivekacaritam/*** *ata evāsyāhorātrika upavāsasaṃvaraḥ prajñaptaḥ/ śanais tadubhayābhyasanārtham iti/*

The fasting restraint [is determined with regard to someone whose] conduct is [characterized by] keeping aloof neither from bad conduct, nor from sensual pleasure. That is exactly why the fasting restraint [lasting] one day and one night is prescribed for him, so that [he] may train in both of them gently.

---

[a] AS_c 特; AS_c (宋, 元 eds.) 持.

[b] $AS_{t,DC}$ *gzhag ce na*; $AS_{t,PNG}$ *bzhag ce na*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,D}$ *gzhag*; $ASVy_{t,P}$ *bzhag*.

[c] $ASBh_{t,PNDC}$ *yang*; $ASBh_{t,G}$ *ni*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *yang*.

[d] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa la*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *la*.

[e] $ASBh_{t,PNG}$ *btags*; $ASBh_{t,DC}$ *brtags*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *brtags*.

[f] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *goms*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *sogs*.

[g] $ASBh_{t,PNDC}$ *bya ba'i*; $ASBh_{t,G}$ *byas pa'i*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *bya ba'i*.

[AS 57,12-13] Partial Observance of Lay Restraints: Status[269]

[AS_c 680a23-24] 若唯修學鄔波索迦一分學處爲說成就。鄔波索迦律儀爲說不成就。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 104b1] *dge bsnyen bslab pa'i gzhi*[a] *phyogs gcig la slob na dge bsnyen gyi sdom pa dang ldan pa zhes*[b] *bya ba'am/ ldan pa ma yin pa zhes bya zhe na*[c]*/*

upāsakaśikṣāpadaikadeśe śikṣamāṇaḥ kim upāsakasaṃvarasamanvāgato vaktavya āhosvid asamanvāgato vaktavyaḥ/

One who trains in [only] one part of the basic points of training of a layman, should he be called "possessed of the restraint of a layman", or should he be called not "possessed of [it]?"

[AS 57,13] Explanation: Partial Observance is Bad Discipline

[AS_c 680a24-25] 應說成就而名犯戒。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 104b1] *ldan pa zhes bya ste*[d]*/ tshul khrims 'chal pa zhes kyang bya'o*[e]*//*

samanvāgato vaktavyaḥ/ duḥśīlo 'pi vaktavyaḥ/

He is to be called possessed of [the restraint]. But he should also be called one who has bad discipline.

---

[a] $AS_{t,DC}$ *gzhi'i*; $AS_{t,PNG}$ *gzhi*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *gzhi'i*.

[b] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa zhes*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *par rig*.

[c] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa zhes bya zhe na*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *par rig par bya*.

[d] $AS_{t,PNG}$ *pa zhes bya ste*; $AS_{t,DC}$ *pa zhes kyang bya*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *par yang rig par bya ba la*.

[e] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa zhes kyang bya'o*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *pa'i gzhir yang brjod par bya'o*.

[AS 57,13-16] Layman Status is not Allowed for "Asexuals and Eunuchs"[270]

[AS$_c$ 680a25-28] 扇搋半擇迦等。爲遮彼受鄔波索迦律儀不耶[a]。不遮彼受鄔波索迦律儀。然遮彼鄔波索迦性。不堪親近承事苾芻苾芻尼等二出家衆故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 104b1-3] *za ma*[b] *dang ma ning rnams la dge bsnyen gyi sdom pa bkag gam/ dge bsnyen gyi sdom pa ma bkag ce na*[c]*/ dge bsnyen nyid ni bkag ste/ dge slong dang dge slong ma'i phyogs gnyis la*[d] *bsnyen bkur bya ba'i 'os ma yin pa'i phyir ro//*

kiṃ ***ṣaṇḍhapaṇḍakānām*** *upāsakasaṃvarapratiṣedhaḥ na vopāsakasaṃvarapratiṣedhaḥ/ nopāsakasaṃvarapratiṣedhaḥ/* ***upāsakatvapratiṣedhas*** *tu/* ***bhikṣubhikṣūṇīpakṣopāsanāyogyatvād/***

Is the restraint of a layman prohibited for asexuals and eunuchs,[271] or not? The restraint of a layman is not prohibited [for them]. But the state of a layman is prohibited. Because they are not proper to wait upon[272] both monks and nuns.

---

[a] AS$_c$ 耶; AS$_c$ (宋, 元, 明, 宮 eds.) 邪.

[b] AS$_{t,PNGD}$ *ma*; AS$_{t,C}$ *na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ma*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bkag ce na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bkag*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *la brten nas*.

[ASBh 68,21-23] Layman Status Prohibited for "Asexuals and Eunuchs": Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 61b1-2] *ji ltar za*[a] *ma dang ma ning rnams*[b] *la ni dge slong dang dge slong ma'i phyogs gnyis*[c] *la bsnyen bkur bya ba'i 'os ma yin pa'i phyir dge bsnyen nyid ni bkag pa bzhin du mtshan gnyis pa rnams kyang de bzhin du ste*[d]*/ skyes pa dang bud med kyi nyon mongs pa kun tu spyod pas phyogs gnyi ga la bsnyen bkur bya ba'i 'os*[e] *ma yin pa'i phyir de dag logs*[f] *shig tu ma shad do//*

[ASBh 68,21-23] *yathā* ***ṣaṇḍapaṇḍakānāṃ*** [g] ***bhikṣubhikṣuṇīpakṣopāsanāyogyatvād upāsakatvapratiṣedhaḥ****, evam ubhayavyañjanānām api strīpuruṣakleśasamudācāreṇobhayapakṣopāsanāyogyateti na te pṛthag uktāḥ/*

Since the state of a layman is prohibited for asexuals and eunuchs because they are not proper to wait upon both monks and nuns, in the same way, also the hermaphrodites are not proper to wait upon both [monks and nuns], because the defilements of both women and men are active in them.[273] Therefore, they are not mentioned separately.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *za*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *tha*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *za*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rnams*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gnyis*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gnyis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gnyi ga*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *du ste*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *du*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *'os*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *don*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'os*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNDC}$ *logs*; ASBh$_{t,G}$ *log*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *logs*.

[g] ASBh$_{MS}$ *ṣaṇḍapaṇḍakānāṃ*; ASBh$_{T}$ *paṇḍapaṇḍakānāṃ*.

[AS 57,16-18] The Five Kinds of "Eunuchs"[274]

[AS$_{c}$ 680a28-29] 又半擇迦有五種。謂生便半擇迦。嫉妬半擇迦。半月[a]半擇迦灌[b]淹灑半擇迦。除去半擇迦

[AS$_{t,P}$ 104b3] *ma ning ni lnga ste/ skyes nas ma ning du gyur*[c] *pa dang/ ma ning phrag dog can dang/ ma ning zla ba*[d] *phyed pa dang/ rlugs*[e] *pa'i ma ning dang/ nyams pa'i ma ning ngo//*

pañca paṇḍakāḥ/ jātipaṇḍaka īrṣyāpaṇḍakaḥ pakṣapaṇḍakaḥ āsekyapaṇḍakaḥ āpatpaṇḍakaś ca//

There are five [kinds of] eunuchs: 1. eunuch by birth,[275] 2. jealous eunuch,[276] 3. moon phase eunuch,[277] 4. inject eunuch,[278] 5. eunuch through accident.[279]

[AS 57,19-20] The Restraint of Absorption[280]

[AS$_{c}$ 680b2-3] 靜慮律儀所攝業者。謂能損伏發起犯戒煩惱種子。離欲界欲者所有遠離。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 104b3-4] *bsam gtan gyi sdom pa gang zhe na*[f]*// 'chal pa'i tshul khrims kun nas slong ba dag gi*[g] *nyon mongs pa rnams kyi sa bon 'joms pa'i dus na 'dod pa la 'dod chags dang bral ba'i*[h][284] *spong ba gang yin pa dang/*

dhyānasaṃvaraḥ *katamaḥ/* ***dauḥśīlya-samutthāpakānāṃ kleśānāṃ bījopaghāte sati***[285] ***kāmebhyo vītarāgasya***[286] ***yā viratiḥ/***

What is the restraint of absorption? It is the abandoning [on the part] of [a person who] has become free from passion[281] towards the objects of desire[282] at the time the seeds [of] the defilements[283] that arouse corrupt discipline are damaged (*upaghāta*).

---

[a] AS$_{c}$ 月; AS$_{c}$ (宋 ed.) 擇.

[b] AS$_{c}$ 灌; AS$_{c}$ (CBETA ed.) 淹.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGD}$ *gyur*; AS$_{t,C}$ *gyurd*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gyur*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *zla ba*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *zla*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *zla ba*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rlugs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *blugs*.

[f] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[g] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *ba dag gi*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *ba'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba dag gis*.

[h] *ba'i*; AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGD}$ *bas*.

[ASBh 68,23-26] The Restraint of Absorption

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 61b2-4] *bsam gtan gyi sdom pa ni 'chal ba'i tshul khrims kun nas slong ba dag gi*[a] *chags pa la sogs pa*[b] *'dod pa na spyod pa'i nyon mongs pa dang/ nye ba'i nyon mongs pa rnams rnam par gnon*[c] *pa'i gnyen pos sa bon bcom pas phyogs gcig pa las 'dod chags dang bral ba nyid du zad de 'dod*[d] *pa dag las 'dod chags dang bral ba'i*[e] *'chal ba'i tshul khrims de*[f] *spong ba gang yin pa'o//*

[ASBh 68,23-26] [§72A(ii)] ***dhyānasaṃvaro dauḥśīlyasamutthāpakānāṃ*** *lobhādīnāṃ*[g] *kāmāvacarāṇām kleśopakleśānāṃ viṣkambhaṇa-pratipakṣeṇa* ***bījopaghāte sati*** *pradeśa*[ASBh$_{MS}$ 62a]*vairāgyeṇāpi*[h] ***kāmebhyo vītarāgasya yā*** *tasmād dauḥśīlyād*[i] ***viratiḥ****/*

The restraint of absorption is the abandoning of that corrupt discipline [on the part] of [a person who has become] free from passion towards the objects of desire, even if it is through a partial dispassion [only],[287] at the time the seeds [of] the defilements and secondary defilements belonging to the realm of desire, like greed and so on, that arouse that corrupt discipline have been damaged by means of the antidote that blocks [those primary and secondary defilements].

---

a ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *dag gi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGD}$ *la*.

b ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *sogs pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *sogs pa*; ASVy$_{t,PNG}$ *sogs*.

c ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *gnon*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *gnyon*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gnon*.

d ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *phyogs gcig pa las 'dod chags dang bral ba nyid du zad de 'dod*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *phyogs gcig pa las 'dod chags dang bral ba nyid du zad do// 'dod*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'dod*.

e ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGD}$ *bas*.

f *de*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *te*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGD}$ *de*.

g ASBh$_{T}$ *lobhādīnāṃ*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *lobhāvacarādīnāṃ*.

h ASBh$_{T}$ *vairāgyeṇāpi*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *vairāgyenāpi*.

i ASBh$_{MS}$ *dauḥśīlyād*; ASBh$_{T}$ *vauḥśīlyād*.

[AS 57,20-22] Freedom from Attachment to the First to Third *Dhyāna*

[AS_c 680b3-5] 離初靜慮欲者所有遠離。離第二靜慮欲者所有遠離。離第三靜慮欲者所有遠離。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 104b4-5] *bsam gtan dang po la 'dod chags dang bral ba dang/ bsam gtan gnyis pa la 'dod chags dang bral ba dang/ bsam gtan gsum pa la 'dod chags dang bral bas*[a] *spong ba gang yin pa'o//*

prathamadhyānavītarāgasya dvitīyadhyānavītarāgasya ***tṛtīyadhyānavītarāgasya yā viratiḥ****/*

[It is, moreover,] the abandoning [of corrupt discipline on the part] of [a person] who has become free from passion towards the first level of absorption, of [a person] who has become free from passion towards the second level of absorption, [and] of [a person] who has become free from passion towards the third level of absorption.

[ASBh 68,26-27] The Seeds of the Defilements Leading to Wrong Behaviour Are Damaged

[$ASBh_{t,P}$ 61b4-5] *bsam gtan gsum pa'i bar las 'dod chags dang bral ba'i ring du byed pa'i gnyen pos 'chal ba'i tshul khrims*[b] *kun nas slong ba de*[c] *dag nyid kyi*[d] *sa bon shin tu 'joms par rig*[e] *par bya'o//*

[ASBh 68,26-27] *yāvat* ***tṛtīyadhyānavītaragasya*** *dūrībhāva pratipakṣeṇa teṣām eva dauḥśīlyasamutthāpakānāṃ sutarām bījopaghāto veditavyaḥ/*

All the more–so one should know–the seeds of those same [defilements] that arouse corrupt discipline are damaged, [in this case] through the antidote [leading to their] becoming far away (*dūrībhāva*), [in the case] of [persons who have become free from passion towards the first *dhyāna*] up to [a person] who has become free from passion towards the third level of absorption.[288]

---

[a] *ba'i*; $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *bas*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PNGD}$ *ba*.

[b] $ASBh_{t,PNG}$ *khrims*; $ASBh_{t,DC}$ *khrims kyi*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *khrims*.

[c] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *de*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PNGD}$ *de/ de*.

[d] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *kyi*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PNG}$ *kyi*; $ASVy_{t,D}$ *kyis*.

[e] $ASBh_{t,PNGD}$ *rig*; $ASBh_{t,C}$ *rigs*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *rig*.

[ASBh 68,27-28] From the Fourth *Dhyāna* on, There is no Restraint Consisting in Discipline

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 61b5-6] *bsam gtan bzhi pa la 'dod chags dang bral ba'i*[a] *ni gzugs med pa rnams na*[b] *gzugs med pa'i phyir tshul khrims kyi sdom pa rnam par gzhag*[c][289] *pa med par rig par bya'o//*

[ASBh 68,27-28] *caturtha dhyānavītarāgasya tv ārupyeṣu rūpābhāvāc chīlasaṃvarāvyavasthānaṃ veditavyam/*

[In the case] of [a person] who has become free from passion towards the fourth *dhyāna*, however, no restraint consisting in discipline is established because in the immaterial realms there is no [corporeal] matter.[290]

[AS 57,22] [AS$_c$: Bodily and Vocal *Karman* in the Restraint of Absorption]

[AS$_c$ 680b5-6] 是名靜慮律儀所攝身語業

[Addition by XUANZANG: "Those are the bodily and vocal *karman* that are included in what is called the restraint of absorption."][291]

[AS 58,1-3] Definition of Unstained Restraint[292]

[AS$_c$ 680b7-9] 無漏律儀所攝業者。謂以見諦者[293]由無漏作意力。所得無漏遠離戒性。是名無漏律儀所攝業

[AS$_{t,P}$ 104b5-6] *zag pa med pa'i sdom pa gang zhe na*[d]*/ bden pa mthong ba*[e] *zag pa med pa'i yid la byed pas*[f] *spangs pa*[294] *gang yin pa'o//*

anāsravasaṃvaraḥ katamaḥ/ dṛṣṭa-satyasyānāsravamanaskāreṇa yā viratiḥ/

What is the restraint without inflow? It is the abandoning–by means of attention without inflow–[on the part] of [a person who] has seen the [Four] Truths.

---

[a] *ba'i*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGD}$ *ba*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *na*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *na*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,D}$ *gzhag*; ASBh$_{t,PNGC}$ *bzhag*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gzhag*; ASVy$_{t,PNG}$ *bzhag*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *ba*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *ba'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba'i*.

[f] AS$_{t,DC}$ *pa'i yid la byed pas*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'i yid la byed pa*.

[AS 58,3-7] Non-Restraint: The Persons Observing Non-Restraint[295]

[AS$_{c}$ 680b10-14] 云何不律儀業。謂諸不律儀者。或由生彼種姓[a]中故。或由受持彼事業故。所期現行彼業決定。何等名爲不律儀者。所謂屠羊養鷄養猪捕鳥捕魚獵鹿罝兎劫賊魁膾控[b]牛[296]縛象立壇呪龍守獄讒搆好爲損等

[AS$_{t,P}$ 104b6-8] *sdom pa ma yin pa gang zhe na*[c]*/ sdom pa ma yin pa bshan*[d] *pa dang/ bya gag bsod*[e] *pa pa dang/ phag gis 'tsho ba dang/ nya pa dang/ ri dags kyi rngon*[f] *pa dang/ bya pa dang/ bong rgyas 'tsho*[g] *ba dang/ chom rkun pa dang/ gshed ma dang/ glang po che 'dzin pa dang/ sbrul gyis 'tsho ba dang/ btson srungs*[h] *dang/ nyan rna byed pa dang gnod pa byed pa*[i] *rnams kyi gang yin pa'o// de dag*[j] *las skyes pas sam/ yang dag par blangs pas te*[k]*/ de dag gi las spyad pas*[l] *nges par byas pa'o*[m]*//*

What is non-restraint? The decision, taken either because of being born into [such a group] or because of [deliberately] taking up their occupation, of [persons in] non-restraint, i.e. shepherds,[297] poulterers, pig breeders, bird hunters, fishermen, deer hunters, rabbit hunters, thieves, executioners, elephant tamers, snake charmers, prison guards, spies, or torturers, to commit the

---

[a] AS$_{c}$ 姓; AS$_{c}$ (宋, 元, 明, 宮 eds.) 性.

[b] AS$_{c}$ 控; AS$_{c}$ (宮 ed.) 害. Cf. AS$_{c}$ (中華 ed.) 害.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bshan*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *shan*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *shan*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bsod*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *gsod*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bsod*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gsod*.

[f] AS$_{t,DC}$ *rngon*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *sngon*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rngon*.

[g] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bong rgyas 'tsho*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *bong rgyas 'tshor*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ri bong rgyas shor*.

[h] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *srungs*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *srung*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *srung*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *bsrungs*.

[i] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pa*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *pa pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[j] AS$_{t,PN}$ *dag*; AS$_{t,G}$ *dag gi*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *dag gi rigs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dag gi*.

[k] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pas te*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *pa ste*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa ste*.

[l] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pas*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *par*.

[m] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *so*.

asaṃvaraḥ katamat/ āsaṃvarikānām ***aurabhrikakaukkuṭika****śaukarikaśākuntikamātsikā mṛgalubdhakaśaśavāgurikacauravadhyaghātaka-***nāgabandhakanāgamaṇḍalika****bandhanapālakāsū cakakāraṇākārapakāṇām yo* ***'bhijanmato vā*** *tat-karma****samādānato*** *vā* ***tatkarmādhyācāra-niścayaḥ/***

actions that are [the occupations] of these [groups].

[ASBh 69,1-2] Persons Observing Non-Restraint: Shepherds

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 61b6] *shan pa ni gang dag phyugs rnams bsad nas de 'tshong bas 'tsho*[a] *bar byed pa rnams so//*

[ASBh 69,1-2] [§72b] ***aurabhrikā*** *ye paśūn hatvā tadvikrayeṇa jīvikāṃ kalpayanti/*

Shepherds are those who make their living by killing cattle and selling them.

[ASBh 69,2] Persons Observing Non-Restraint: Poulterers and so on

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 61b7] *bya gag gsod*[b] *pa la sogs pa la*[c] *yang de bzhin du ji*[d] *ltar mthun mthun du sbyar*[e] *bar bya'o//*

[ASBh 69,2] *evaṃ* ***kaukkuṭikā****dayo yathāsaṃbhavaṃ yojayitavyāḥ/*

In the same way, [professions of] poulterers, and so on, are to be joined with [a suitable explanation] as appropriate.

[ASBh 69,2-3] Persons Observing Non-Restraint: Elephant Holders

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 61b7] *glang po che 'dzin pa ni gang dag nags nas glang po che bzung*[f] *nas 'dul bar byed pa rnams so//*

[ASBh 69,2-3] ***nāgabandhakā*** *ye 'raṇyāt*[g] *hastino baddhvā damayanti*[h]*/*

Elephant holders are those who catch elephants from the wilderness and tame them.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'tshong bas 'tsho*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *'tsho bas 'tsho*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *'tsho*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gsod*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gsod*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bsod*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *la sogs pa la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *la*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ji*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *ji*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *de*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *sbyar*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *sbyor*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *sbyar*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,NDC}$ *bzung*; ASBh$_{t,PG}$ *gzung*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bzung*.

[g] °*kā ye araṇyāt*; ASBh$_{T}$ °*kā araṇyāt*; ASBh$_{MS}$ °*kā 'raṇyāt* (unclear)

[h] *damayanti*; ASBh$_{T}$ *da[ma]yanti*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *dayanti*.

[ASBh 69,3-4] Persons Observing Non-Restraint: Snake Charmers

[$ASBh_{t,P}$ 61b7-8] *sbrul gyis 'tsho ba*[a] *ni gang dag sbrul bzung*[b] *nas rtse bas 'tsho bar byed pa rnams so//*

[ASBh 69,3-4] ***nāgamaṇḍalikā*** *ye sarpān ādāya tatkrīḍanair jīvanti/*

Snake charmers are those who catch snakes and live on playing with them.

[ASBh 69,4] Persons Observing Non-Restraint: Spies

[$ASBh_{t,P}$ 61b8] *nyan rna ba ni gang dag gzhan dag la*[c] *phra mas gnod par byas nas 'tsho bar byed pa rnams so//*

[ASBh 69,4] ***sūcakā***[d] *ye parān paiśunyenopahatya jīvanti/*

Spies are those who live on harming others through slander.[298]

[ASBh 69,4-5] Observing Non-Restraint as a Family Profession or by Choice: Explanation

[$ASBh_{t,P}$ 61b8-62a1] *de dag gi las skyes pas sam yang dag par blangs pa ste*[e] *zhes bya ba ni de'i rigs sam/ gzhan gyi rigs kyi go rim*[f] *bzhin no//*

[ASBh 69,4-5] ***abhijanmato vā tatkarmasamādānato*** ***veti*** *tatkulīnasyānyakulīnasya*[g] *ca*[h] *yathākramam/*

"Because one who is born [from people with those occupations], or because one has taken up that occupation" refers to someone who belongs to those families, or someone from another family, respectively.

---

[a] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *ba rnams*.

[b] $ASBh_{t,DC}$ *bzung*; $ASBh_{t,PNG}$ *gzung*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,D}$ *bzung*; $ASVy_{t,P}$ *gzung*.

[c] $ASBh_{t,DC}$ *dag la*; $ASBh_{t,GN}$ *dag las*; $ASBh_{t,P}$ *las*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *dag la*.

[d] $ASBh_{MS}$ *sūcakā*; $ASBh_{T}$ *mūtrakā*.

[e] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *ste*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *ste/ de la skyes pa*.

[f] $ASBh_{t,N}$ *rim*; $ASBh_{t,PGDC}$ *rims*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,P}$ *rim*; $ASVy_{t,D}$ *rims*.

[g] $ASBh_{T}$ *tatkulīnasyānyasya kulīnasya*; $ASBh_{MS}$ *tatkulīnasyasyānyasya kulīnasya*.

[h] ASBh 69, n.1: "T. & Ch. *vā*."

[ASBh 69,5-6] The Speech Act Establishing Non-Restraint

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 62a1-2] *de dag gi las spyad par nges par byas pa ni lus dang ngag gi sbyor ba sngon du btang ba*[a] *ste/*[b] *sdom pa ma yin pa zhes bya'o*[c]*//*

[ASBh 69,5-6] *kāyavākprayogapūrvakaḥ* ***tatkarmādhyācāraniścayo 'saṃvara***[d] *ity ucyate/*

The decision (*niścaya*), preceded by a preparation through body or speech, that one will perform the action of such [people] regularly (*adhyācāra*) is called "non-restraint".

[AS 58,8-9] Neither Restraint nor Non-Restraint[299]

[AS$_c$ 680b15-16] 云何非律儀非不律儀業。謂住非律儀非不律儀者。所有善不善業

[AS$_{t,P}$ 104b8-105a1] *sdom pa yang ma yin sdom pa ma yin yang pa ma yin pa gang zhe na*[e]*/ sdom pa'ang*[f] *ma yin sdom pa ma yin pa'ang*[g] *ma yin pa'i las dge ba'am mi dge ba gang yin pa'o//*

naiva saṃvaro nāsaṃvaraḥ *katamaḥ/ naivasaṃvaranāsaṃvarikasya yat kuśalākuśalaṃ* ***karma****/*

What is neither restraint nor non-restraint? It is the either wholesome or unwholesome *karman* of a person who is neither subject to restraint nor to non-restraint.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *btang ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *btang*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ste/*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ste/ de dag gi las spyad par nges par byas pa ni/*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bya'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *brjod par bya'o*.

[d] ASBh$_T$ *tatkarmādhyācāraniścayo 'saṃvara*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *tatkarmādhyācāraḥ niścayaḥ/ asaṃvara*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[f] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pa'ang*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *pa yang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'ang*.

[g] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pa'ang*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *pa yang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'ang*.

[ASBh 69,7-8] Neither Restraint nor Non-Restraint: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 62a2-3] *ji skad bshad pa'i sdom pa dang sdom pa ma yin pa dang*[a] *mi ldan pa'i sbyin pa dang/ ngag snyan pa la sogs pa dang/ khu tshur*[b] *dang thal lcag*[c] *la sogs pa'i las ni sdom pa yang ma yin/ sdom pa ma yin pa yang ma yin pa zhes bya'o*[d]*//*

[ASBh 69,7-8]] [§72C] *yathoktasaṃvarāsaṃvara-vinirmuktasya dānapriya vacanādikaṃ khaṭacapeṭādikaṃ ca* ***karma naiva saṃvaro nāsaṃvara*** *ity ucyate/*

An action [that consists in] giving, friendly speech, and so on, and punches or slaps, and so on, [as acts] of a person who is devoid of restraint as well as non-restraint as [they] have been taught, is called "neither restraint nor non-restraint".

[AS 58,10-11] [AS$_c$: Three Kinds of *Karman*][300]

[AS$_c$ 680b17-18] 又業差別有三種。謂順樂受業。順苦受業。順不苦不樂受業。

[Explanation by XUANZANG: "Moreover [as for] the division of *karman*, there are three kinds, namely: the *karman* that is to be experienced as pleasure (*sukha*), the *karman* that is to be experienced as suffering (*duḥkha*) and the *karman* that is to be experienced as neither pleasure nor suffering."]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *dang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *dang*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *'ang*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *tshur*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *tshul*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *tshur*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *lcag*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *lcags*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *lcag*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *lcags*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin pa zhes bya'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *yin pa zhes brjod par bya'o*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *yin zhe na/ brjod par bya'o*.

[AS 58,11-12] *Karman* to be Experienced as Joy: Definition

[AS$_c$ 680b18-19] 順樂受業者。謂從欲界乃至第三靜慮所有善業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105a1-2] *bde ba*[a] *myong bar 'gyur pa'i las gang zhe na*[b]*/ 'dod pa'i khams dang/ bsam gtan gsum po dag gi dge ba gang yin pa'o//*

sukhavedanīyaṃ karma katamat/ yat kāmadhātu-tridhyānakuśalaṃ//

What is the *karman* that is to be experienced as pleasant? It is the wholesome [*karman*] of the desire realm and the [first] three *dhyānas*.[301]

[AS 58,13] *Karman* to be Experienced as Suffering: Definition[302]

[AS$_c$ 680b19] 順苦受業者。謂不善業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105a2] *sdug bsngal myong bar 'gyur ba'i las gang zhe na*[c]*/ gang mi dge ba'o//*

duḥkhavedanīyaṃ karma katamat/ yad akuśalaṃ//

What is the *karman* that is to be experienced as unpleasant? It is the unwholesome [*karman*].

[AS 58,13-14] *Karman* to be Experienced as Neither Suffering nor Joy: Definition

[AS$_c$ 680b20-21] 順不苦不樂受業者。謂第三靜慮已上所有善業

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105a2-3] *sdug bsngal yang ma yin bde ba yang ma yin pa myong bar 'gyur ba'i las gang zhe na*[d]*/ bsam gtan gsum po*[e] *las gong ma'i dge ba'o//*

aduḥkhāsukhavedanīyaṃ karma katamat/ tṛtīya-dhyānād ūrdhvaṃ yat kuśalaṃ//

What is the karman that is to be experienced neither as suffering nor as joy? It is the wholesome [*karman*] above the third *dhyāna*.

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGD}$ *ba*; AS$_{t,C}$ *bar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *po*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *po*.

[AS 58,15-16] [AS$_c$: Three Kinds of *Karman*][303]

[AS$_c$ 680b22-23] 又業差別有三種。謂順現法受業。順生受業。順後受業。

[Explanation by XUANZANG: "Moreover [as for] the division of *karman*, there are three kinds, namely: the *karman* that is to be experienced in this lifetime, the *karman* that is to be experienced after rebirth, the *karman* that is to be experienced later."]

[AS 58,16-18] *Karman* to be Experienced in this Lifetime[304]

[AS$_c$ 680b23-25] 順現法受業者。若業於現法中異熟成熟。謂從慈定起已。於彼造作若損若益必得現異熟。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105a3-4] *mthong ba'i chos la myong bar 'gyur pa'i las gang zhe na*[a]*/ gang mthong ba'i chos la rnam par smin pa rnam*[b] *par smin par 'gyur ba ste/ 'di lta ste*[c]*/ byams pa'i ting nge 'dzin las langs pa la phan 'dogs pa dang/ gnod par*[d] *byed pa las byung ba dang/*

dṛṣṭadharmavedanīyaṃ karma *katamat/ dṛṣṭe dharme yadvipāko vipacyate/ tadyathā maitrī-samādher vyutthitasyānugrahopaghātamayam/*[306]

What is the *karman* to be experienced in this lifetime? It is that, the ripening of which ripens in this lifetime, namely, that [*karman*] which comes from doing damage or benefit to someone who has arisen from the concentration[305] of benevolence.

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba'i las gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba gang*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rnam par smin pa rnam*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rnam*.

[c] AS$_{t,DC}$ *'di lta ste*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *'di ltar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *'di lta ste*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *'di ltar ste*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *par*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *pa*.

[ASBh 69,9] *Karman* to be Experienced in this Lifetime: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 62a3] *mthong ba'i chos la myong bar 'gyur ba'i las ni tshe gang la byas pa de nyid la gang rnam par smin par 'gyur ba'o//*

[ASBh 69,9] [§73(i)] ***dṛṣṭadharmavedanīyaṃ karma*** *yatra janmani*[a] *kṛtaṃ*[b] *tatraiva yad vipacyate/*

The *karman* to be experienced in this lifetime is that which ripens in the very birth in which it has been done.

[AS 58,18-21] *Karman* to be Experienced in this Lifetime: Examples

[AS$_c$ 680b25-29] 如從慈定起。從無諍定起。從滅定起。從預流果起。從阿羅漢果起亦爾。又於佛爲上首僧中造善惡業必得現異熟。又有餘猛利意樂方便所行善不善業亦得現異熟。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105a4-6] *byams pa'i ting nge 'dzin*[c] *ji lta bar nyon mongs pa med pa'i ting nge 'dzin dang/ 'gog pa'i*[d] *snyoms par 'jug pa dang/ rgyun du zhugs pa'i 'bras bu dang/ dgra bcom pa'i 'bras bu las langs pa dang/ sangs rgyas la sogs pa dge slong gi dge 'dun la'ang*[e] *de bzhin no/ yang na gang*[f] *bsam pa shin tu*[309] *drag pos sbyor*[g] *bas dge ba'am*[h] *mi dge ba spyod pa'o//*

yathā maitrīsamādhes tathā araṇasamādher[310] *nirodhasamāpatteḥ*[311] *srotaāpāttiphalād arhattvaphalāc ca vyutthitasya*[312] *buddhapramukhasya ca bhikṣusaṅghasya/ yad vā tīvratarāśayaprayogeṇa kuśalākuśalaṃ samācarati//*

As [in the case of deeds which one performs in order to do harm or benefit to someone arisen] from the concentration of benevolence, and likewise to one arisen from the concentration without defilements, from the meditative attainment of cessation, from the fruit of a stream enterer,[307] [or] from the fruit of an Arhat,[308] and to the monastic community headed by the Buddha. Or, whatever wholesome or wholesome [deeds] which one performs with a perception [accompanied by] a particularly strong motivation (*āśaya*). [All those lead to results to be experienced in this lifetime.]

[a] ASBh 69, n. 2: "Ms. inserts *tat.*"

[b] ASBh$_T$ *kṛtaṃ*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *tatkṛtaṃ.*

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'dzin.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'dzin las.*

[d] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pa'i*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *pa la.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'i.*

[e] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *la'ang.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *la yang.*

[f] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *na gang.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *na.*

[g] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *sbyor.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *sbyar.*

[h] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'am.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dang.*

[AS 58,22-59,2] *Karman* to be Experienced after Rebirth: Definition

[AS$_{c}$ 680b29-c2] 順生受業者。若業於無間生中異熟成熟。謂五無間業。復有所餘善不善業[a]。於無間生異熟熟[b]者。一切皆名順生受業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105a6-7] *skyes nas myong bar 'gyur ba'i las gang zhe na*[c]*/ gang tshe phyi ma nyid la rnam par smin pa rnam*[d] *par smin par 'gyur ba ste/ 'di lta ste/ mtshams med pa lnga'i las rnams so// yang na dge ba'am*[e] *mi dge ba gzhan yang yin no//*

upapadyavedanīyaṃ karma *katamat/ saṃparāya eva yadvipāko vipacyate/* ***tadyathā pañcānantaryāṇi karmāṇi/*** *anyad vā punar kuśalākuśalaṃ/*

What is the *karman* that is to be experienced after rebirth? It is that, the ripening of which ripens in the very next lifetime. For example, the *karman* that consists in the five actions [that bring] immediate [retribution].[313] Or, again, other [kinds of] wholesome and unwholesome [*karman*].

[ASBh 69,10-11] *Karman* to be Experienced after Rebirth: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 62a3-4] *skyes nas myong bar 'gyur ba'i las ni gang de ma thag tu 'byung ba'i tshe la myong bar 'gyur ba ste/ 'di ltar mtshams med pa lnga'i las rnams so//*

[ASBh 69,10-11] [§73(ii)] ***upapadyavedanīyaṃ*** *yad anantare janmani,* ***tadyathā*** [ASBh$_{MS}$ 62B] ***pañcānantaryāṇi karmāṇi/***

The [*karman* that is] to be experienced after rebirth is [the *karman* that ripens] in the immediately following rebirth, i.e. the five immediate actions.

---

[a] AS$_{c}$ 善業; AS$_{c}$ (宮 ed.) 善.

[b] AS$_{c}$ 熟熟; AS$_{c}$ (宮 ed.) 熟.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rnam par smin pa rnam*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rnam*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *ba'am*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *ba dang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *ba dang*. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *ba*.

[ASBh 69,11-12] Explanation: Several Acts to be Experienced after Rebirth Ripen in One Lifetime

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 62a4-6] *gang gi*[a] *mtshams med pa gcig nyid ni*[b] *de'i rnam par smin pa de de*[c] *ma thag par rigs na/ de gang gi mang po gang yin pa de'i de dag gi rnam par smin pa ji ltar myong bar 'gyur zhe na/ thams cad kyi rnam par smin pa cig*[d] *car myong bar 'gyur te/ 'di ltar mtshams med pa du ma byed pa'i lus shin tu rab tu gzhon*[e] *par mngon par 'grub la/ chad pa yang mang*[f] *zhing/ mi bzad la*[g] *sna tshogs pa 'byung ste*[h]*/ de'i dbang gis*[i] *tshor ba shin tu mang po 'byung bar*[j] *'gyur ro//*

[ASBh 69,11-14] *yasya tāvad eka*[k] *m evānantaryaṃ tasya tadvipāko*[l] *'nantaraṃ yuktaḥ, yasyedānīṃ saṃbahulāni tasya kathaṃ tadvipāka-pratisaṃvedanā/ sarveṣāṃ yugapad vipākaḥ pratisaṃvedyate*[m]*, tathā hy anekānantaryakāriṇa āśrayaḥ sukumārataro nirvartate/ kāraṇāś ca bahutīvravicitrā yadvaśād bhūyasīṃ vedanāṃ pratyanubhavati/*

To begin with, for one [who has done] only one [action that brings] immediate [retribution], it is reasonable that the ripening of that [immediate action arises] immediately for him. Now, for one who has done many [immediate actions], how does the experience of their ripening [arise] for him? The ripening of all of them is experienced simultaneously. For an extremely delicate body (*āśraya*) comes about for the one who does several immediate [actions], and there are many, violent and variegated tortures through the power of which he experiences many more painful sensations (*vedanā*).

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gis*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gcig nyid ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gcig ni*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gcig*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *de de*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *de des*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *cig*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *gcig*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *cig*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gzhon*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gnon*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yang mang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *mang*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *la*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[h] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa 'byung ste*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *par 'gyur te*.

[i] ASBh$_{t,PNDC}$ *gis*; ASBh$_{t,G}$ *gi* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gis*.

[j] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'byung bar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *'byung bar*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *'byung*.

[k] ASBh 69, n. 3: "T. & Ch. omit *tāvat*."

[l] ASBh 69, n. 4: "T. inserts *tat*."

[m] *pratisaṃvedyate*; ASBh$_{T,MS}$ *pratisaṃvidyate*.

[ASBh 69,15-16] Explanation: The Onset of Ripening Counts for the Categorization

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 62a6-7] *rtsom pa'i dbang du byas nas mthong ba'i chos la myong bar 'gyur ba*[a] *la sogs pa 'di dag rnam par gzhag*[b] *gi/ de tsam la myong bar 'gyur ba'i dbang du byas pa ni ma yin no//*

[ASBh 69,15-16] *ārambhaṃ ca praty etāni dṛṣṭa-dharmavedanīyādīni vyavasthāpyante/ na tanmātra vedanīyatām adhikṛtya/*

Those [categories] "to be experienced in this lifetime" and so on are determined on account of the beginning, not with regard to their being experienced in this [lifetime] only.

[ASBh 69,16-17] Explanation: Result Begins in this Lifetime is "to be Experienced in This Lifetime"

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 62a7-8] *tshe de nyid la gang gi*[c] *rnam par smin pa rnam par smin par rtsom pa de ni mthong ba'i chos la myong bar 'gyur ba'o//*

[ASBh 69,16-17] *yasya tatraiva janmani vipāko vipaktum ārabhate tad dṛṣṭadharmavedanīyam/*

That the ripening of which begins to ripen in this birth, that is "to be experienced in this lifetime."

[ASBh 69,17] Explanation: Result Begins in Next Lifetime: "to be Experienced after Rebirth"[314]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 62a8] *gang de ma thag pa'i tshe la rtsom pa de ni skyes nas myong bar 'gyur ba'o//*

[ASBh 69,17] *yasyānantare janmany ārabhate tad upapadyavedanīyam/*

That, [the ripening of which] begins in the next birth, that is "to be experienced after rebirth."

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *ba*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *bas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *ba*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bar*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *gzhag*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *bzhag*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gzhag*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bzhag*.

[c] *gi*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gi*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gis*.

[ASBh 69,17-20] Explanation: After Next Lifetime; Conformity of Avadāna Doctrine

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 62a8-b2] *gang de ma thag tu 'byung*[a] *ba'i tshe thal nas rtsom pa de ni lan grangs gzhan la myong bar 'gyur ba ste/ de ltar byas na ni kyi hud sems zhes bya ba'i rtogs*[b] *pa brjod pa las mtshams med pa'i*[c] *las kyi rnam par smin pas*[d] *sems can dmyal bar*[e] *yang dang yang 'chi 'pho zhing skye bas*[f] *rnam par smin pa*[g] *myong ngo zhes 'byung ba*[h] *dang mthun par byas pa yin no//*

[ASBh 69,17-20] *yasyānantaraṃ janma laṃghayitvārabhate*[i]*/ tad aparaparyāyavedanīyam ity [/] evaṃ ca kṛtvā hācittāvadāne*[j] *ānantaryasya karmaṇo narake punaḥpunaś cyutyupapādena vipākapratisaṃvedanam anulomitaṃ bhavatīti/*

That, [the ripening of which] begins having exceeded the next birth; that is "to be experienced in another lifetime." And by having made [such an explanation, the fact that] in the *Hācittāvadāna* the ripening of immediate action is experienced by repeated death and rebirth in hell", has now been [considered] appropriately.

[AS 59,3-4] *Karman* to be Experienced in Another Lifetime: Explanation

[AS$_c$ 680c2-4] 順後受業者。若業於無間生。後異熟成熟。是名順後受業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105a7] *lan grangs gzhan la myong bar 'gyur ba'i las gang zhe na*[a]*/ gang de phan chad du rnam par smin pa rnam*[b] *par smin par 'gyur ba'o//*

What is the *karman* to be experienced in another lifetime? That, the ripening of which ripens in a lifetime later than that

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'byung*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *byung*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rtogs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *rtogs*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *rtog*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa lnga'i*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'i*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNDC}$ *bar*; ASBh$_{t,G}$ *ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bar*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *bas*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *bos*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bar*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *pa*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *pas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[h] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'byung ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gsungs pa*.

[i] ASBh$_{MS}$ *laṃghayitvārabhate*; ASBh$_T$ *laghayitvārabhate*.

[j] ASBh 69, n. 5: "T. & Ch. mention it as the name of an *avadāna*."

aparaparyāyavedanīyaṃ karma katamat/ tasmāt pareṇa[315] *yadvipāko vipacyate/*

[following lifetime].

[AS 59,5-6] [AS$_c$: Four Kinds of *Karman*][316]

[AS$_c$ 680c4-6] 又業差別有四種。謂黑黑異熟業。白白異熟業。異熟業。非黑白無異熟業能盡諸業。

[Explanation by XUANZANG: "Moreover [as for] the division of *karman*, there are four kinds, namely: black *karman* with black ripening, white *karman* with white ripening, black and white *karman* with black and white ripening. Not black [and] white *karman* without ripening which extinguishes all *karma*s.]

[AS 59,6-7] Black *Karman* with Black Ripening: Definition[317]

[AS$_c$ 680c6] 黑黑異熟業者。謂不善業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105a7-8] *gnag la rnam par smin pa gnag pa'i*[c] *las gang zhe na*[d]*/ gang mi dge ba'o//*

kṛṣṇaṃ kṛṣṇavipākaṃ *karma katamat/ yad* ***akuśalam//***

What is black *karman* with black ripening? That which is unwholesome.

[ASBh 69,21-22] Black *Karman* with Black Ripening: Explanation[318]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 62b2] *gnag la rnam par smin pa gnag pa'i las ni mi dge ba ste/ nyon mongs pa can dang rnam par smin pa mi 'dod pa*[e] *yin pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 69,21-22] [§74(i)] ***kṛṣṇaṃ kṛṣṇavipākaṃ karmākuśalam****, kliṣṭatvād aniṣṭavipākatvāc ca//*

Black *karman* with black ripening is the unwholesome [*karman*]. Because it is defiled, and because its ripening is unwanted.

[AS 59,7-8] White *Karman* with White Ripening: Definition

[AS$_c$ 680c6-7] 白白異熟業者。謂三界善業。

What is white *karman* with white

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rnam par smin pa rnam*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rnam*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa gnag pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'i*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PDC}$ *pa mi 'dod pa*; ASBh$_{t,NG}$ *pa mi 'dod pa ma*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105a8] *dkar la rnam par smin pa dkar ba'i las gang zhe na*[a]*/ khams gsum pa'i dge ba'o//*

śuklaṃ śuklavipākaṃ** karma katamat/ **traidhātukaṃ kuśalam//

ripening? The wholesome [*karman*] of the three realms.

[ASBh 69,23] White *Karman* with White Ripening: Explanation[319]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 62b2-3] *bzlog pa ni dkar la rnam par smin pa dkar ba ste/ khams gsum pa'i dge ba'o//*

[ASBh 69,23] [§74(ii)] *viparyayāc **chuklaṃ śuklavipākaṃ traidhātukaṃ kuśalam/***[b]

Conversely, white [*karman*] with white ripening is the wholesome [*karman*] of the three realms.[320]

[AS 59,8-10] White and Black *Karman* with White and Black Ripening: Definition

[AS$_c$ 680c7-7] 黑白黑白異熟業者。謂欲界繫雜業。或有業意樂故黑方便故白。或有業方便故黑意樂故白。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105a8-b1] *dkar gnag*[c] *du gyur la rnam par smin pa dkar gnag du 'gyur*[d] *ba gang zhe na*[e]*/ gang 'dod*[f] *pa dang rab tu ldan pa'i 'dren ma ste/ bsam pas*[g] *gnag la sbyor bas dkar ba'am/ sbyor bas gnag la bsam pas dkar ba'o//*

kṛṣṇaśuklaṃ kṛṣṇaśuklavipākaṃ** karma katamat/ yat **kāmapratisaṃyuktaṃ vyāmiśram/ āśayataḥ kṛṣṇam prayogataḥ śuklam/ prayogato** vā **kṛṣṇam āśayataḥ śuklam//

What is white and black [*karman*] with white and black ripening? That which is connected with [the realm of] desire[321] [and] mixed. [It is] either black from [the point of view of its] disposition and white from [the point of view of its] preparation, or black from [the point of view of its] preparation and white from [the point of view of its] disposition.

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGCD}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[b] ASBh 69, n. 6: "Ch. adds *akliṣṭatvād iṣṭavipākatvāc ca*."

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gnag*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gnag*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *nag*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'gyur*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gyur*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[f] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *gang 'dod*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *'dod*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang 'dod*.

[g] AS$_{t,DC}$ *pas*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pas*.

[ASBh 69,24-25] White and Black *Karman* with White and Black Ripening: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 62b3-4] *dkar gnag*[a] *tu gyur la/ rnam par smin pa dkar gnag tu gyur pa ni gang 'dod pa dang rab tu ldan pa'i 'dren*[b] *ma*[c] *ste/ dge*[d] *mi dge*[e] *zhes bya ba'i*[f] *tha tshig go//*

[ASBh 69,24-25] [§74(ii)] ***kṛṣṇaśuklaṃ kṛṣṇaśuklavipākaṃ yat kāmapratisaṃyuktaṃ***[g] ***vyā***[h] ***miśraṃ***[i] *kuśalākuśalam ity arthaḥ/*

White and black [*karman*] with white and black ripening is that which is connected with [the realm of] desire [and] mixed. "Wholesome and unwholesome" is the meaning [of this expression, "mixed"].

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *gnag* ; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *nag*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *'dren*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *'dres*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,NGDC}$ *ma*; ASBh$_{t,P}$ *na*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *dge*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de'i dge ba dang*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *dge*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dge ba*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *zhes bya ba'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *zhes bya ba'i*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *ba'i*.

[g] *kāmapratisaṃyuktaṃ*; ASBh$_{T,MS}$ *kāmapratisaṃyuktaṃ vipākaṃ*. ASBh 69, n. 7: "T. & Ch. omit *vipākaṃ* which is proper."

[h] ASBh 69, n. 8: "MS. *vya*."

[i] ASBh$_{T}$ *vyāmiśraṃ*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *vyamiśraṃ*.

[ASBh 69,25-70,2] How do Black and White *Karman* Go Together?[322]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 62b4-5] *gcig*[a] *ci*[b] *ltar*[c] *dge bar yang 'gyur la mi dge bar*[d] *yang 'gyur zhe na/ 'di*[e] *la 'jug pa'i skad cig nges pas*[f] *de gnyi ga brjod pa ni ma yin gyi/ bsam*[g] *pa dang lhan cig pa'i sbyor ba las*[h] *gcig ces bya ste/ 'di ni 'dir*[i] *dgongs pa yin par rig par bya'o//*

[ASBh 69,25-70,2] *katham ekaṃ kuśalaṃ bhavaty akuśalaṃ ca/ nātra* [ASBh$_{MS}$ 63a] *pravṛttikṣaṇa-naiyamye*[j] *nocyate tad evobhayam ity api tu sahāśayaprayogeṇaikaṃ karmety ayam atra abhisaṃdhir veditavyaḥ/*

How [can] one [item] be wholesome as well as unwholesome? In this [context] it is not said by way of limiting [it] to one moment of arising that one and the same (*tad eva*) [*karman*] is both; rather what is to be understood to be the intention here is that [it is] one *karman* in the sense of [considering] the preparation together with the disposition (*āśaya*).

---

a ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *gcig*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *gcig na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gcig*.

b ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ci*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ji*.

c ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ltar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ltar na*.

d ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *bar*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bar*.

e ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'di*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *'di*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *'dis*.

f ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *par*.

g ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bsam*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'on kyang bsam*.

h ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *las*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *la*.

i ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'dir*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *'dir*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *'di ltar*.

j ASBh 70, n. 1: "Ms. has additional *na*."

[ASBh 70,2-3] Explanation on White as well as Black *Karman*: Concluding Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 62b5-6] *de gnyis*[a] *nag po dang dkar po nyid du phan tshun 'dra*[b] *bar gyur bas nag*[c] *po dang dkar po las gcig tu*[d] *rnam par gzhag*[e] *go//*

[ASBh 70,2-3] *tayoś ca kṛṣṇaśuklatāṃ praty anyonyāsādṛśye saty ekaṃ karma kṛṣṇaśuklaṃ vyavasthāpyate/*

And because those two are different from each other as far as their being black or white is concerned, they are determined as one *karman*, that is both black and white.

[ASBh 70,3-4] Black Disposition and White Preparation: Explanation[323]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 62b6-7] *de la*[f] *bsam pa*[g] *gnag la sbyor ba*[h] *dkar ba ste*[i]*/ dper na 'ga' zhig gzhan dag la slu*[j] *bar 'dod nas*[k] *de dag yid ches par bya ba'i mtshan mar bsams pas*[l] *sbyin pa rnams sbyin pa*[m] *nas rab tu 'byung ba'i bar du'o//*

[ASBh 70,3-4] ***tatrāśayataḥ kṛṣṇaṃ prayogataḥ śuklaṃ,*** *yathāpi kaścit parān*[n] *vañcayitukāmas teṣāṃ sampratyayananimittaṃ bhāvena dānāni dadāti yāvat pravrajaty api/*

Here, black from [the point of view of its] disposition and white from [the point of view of its] preparation [means]: Like [when] someone wishing to mislead others really gives donations or even takes ordination in order to make them trust him.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gnyis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gnyi ga*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *phan tshun 'dra*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'dra*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *nag*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de ltar nag*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *las gcig tu*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *nyid du*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *gzhag*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *bzhag*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gzhag*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bzhag*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNDC}$ *la*; ASBh$_{t,G}$ *las*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *la*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pas*.

[h] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *ba*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *bas*.

[i] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *ste*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ni*.

[j] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *slu*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *slu*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bslu*.

[k] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *nas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *na*.

[l] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *nas*.

[m] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *pa rnams sbyin pa*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[n] ASBh$_{T}$ *parān*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *parāṃ*.

[ASBh 70,4-6] Black Preparation, White Disposition: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 62b7-8] *sbyor ba*[a] *gnag la bsam*[b] *pa*[c] *dkar ba ni dper na 'ga' zhig bu'am slob ma la*[d] *mi phan pa bzlog par 'dod cing phan pa la ni*[e] *sbyor bar 'dod nas/ snying brtse ba'i sems kyis lus dang ngag gis*[f] *drag tu byed pa de'i*[g] *tshe/*[h] *kun nas nyon mongs par 'gyur ro//*

[ASBh 70,4-6] ***prayogataḥ kṛṣṇam āśayataḥ śuklam*** *yathāpi kaścit putraṃ vā śiṣyaṃ vā 'hitān nivārayitukāmo hite ca niyojyayitukāmo 'nukampācittaḥ kāyena vācā vā paruṣayaṃs*[324] *tasmin*[i] *kāle saṃkliśyate//*

Black from [the point of view of its] preparation and white from [the point of view of its] disposition is like [when] someone, wishing to keep his son or disciple away from harm and wishing to direct them to [their] welfare, with a caring thought, treats him roughly with body or speech and is at that time defiled [thereby].

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bas*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *bsam*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *bsams*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bsam*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pas*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ma la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ma*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *la ni*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *la ni*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *la*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ngag gis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ngag*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa de'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'i*.

[h] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *tshe/*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *tshe de las*.

[i] ASBh$_{T}$ *paruṣayā tasmin*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *paruṣayasmiṃstasmin* (with elision mark above *smi*?).

[AS 59,10-11] Not Black but White *Karman*: Definition[325]

[AS$_c$ 680c9-10] 非黑白無異熟業能盡諸業者。謂於加行無間道中諸無漏業

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105b1-2] *mi gnag cing*[a] *dkar la rnam par smin par mi 'gyur zhing las zad par 'gyur ba'i las gang zhe na*[b]*/ sbyor ba dang bar chad med pa'i lam rnams la zag pa med pa'i las so//*

akṛṣṇaśuklāvipākaṃ karma karmakṣayāya saṃvartate [328] *katamat/* ***prayogānantaryamārgeṣv anāsravaṃ karma/***

What is not black but white *karman*[326] without ripening [that] is conducive to the extinction of *karman*? It is the *karman* without inflow on the paths of preparation and immediacy.[327]

[ASBh 70,7-8] Not Black but White *Karman*: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 62b8-63a1] *mi gnag cing dkar la*[c] *rnam par smin par mi 'gyur zhing las zad par 'gyur ba'i las gang zhe na*[d]*/ sbyor ba dang bar chad med pa'i lam rnams la zag pa*[e] *med pa'i las zhes bya ba la/ sbyor ba dang bar chad med pa'i lam rnams ni*[f] *spong ba'i gnyen po yin pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 70,7-8] [§74(iv)] ***akṛṣṇaśuklāvipākaṃ karma karmakṣayāya saṃvartate prayogānantaryamārgeṣv anāsravaṃ***[g] ***karma*** *prayogamārgā*[h] *nantaryamārgāṇāṃ prahāṇapratipakṣatvāt/*

Not black but white *karman* without ripening [that] is conducive to the extinction of *karman* is the *karman* without inflow on the path of preparation and immediacy because the paths of preparation and immediacy are the antidote for abandoning.

---

a AS$_{t,PNGD}$ *cing*; AS$_{t,C}$ *ning*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *cing*.

b AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

c ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *la*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *ba*.

d ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*.

e ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *zag pa*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *zag*.

f ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rnams ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rnams*.

g ASBh$_T$ *anāsravaṃ*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *anāsratvavaṃ* (?).

h ASBh 70, n. 2: "T. & Ch. omit *mārga*."

[ASBh 70,8-9] "Not Black", "White", "Without Ripening": Explanation of Terminology

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 63a1-2] *de la mi gnag*[a] *pa ni nyon mongs pa'i dri ma med pa'i phyir ro// dkar ba ni gcig*[b] *tu rnam par byang*[c] *ba'i phyir ro// rnam par smin par mi 'gyur ba ni/ 'khor ba dang mi mthun pa'i*[d] *phyir ro//*

[ASBh 70,8-9] *tatrā**kṛṣṇaṃ** kleśamalābhāvāt/ **śuklam** ekāntavyavadānatvāt/ **avipākaṃ** saṃsāra-virodhitvāt/*

Here, [it is called] "not black" because defilements and stains do not exist [in it]. "White" because it is exclusively [belonging to] purification. "Without ripening" because it is opposed to *saṃsāra*.

[ASBh 70,10-11] "Comes about for the Extinction of *Karman*": Explanation[329]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 63a2-3] *las zad par 'gyur ba ni nag po la sogs pa zag ba dang bcas pa'i las las*[e] *rnam pa gsum po 'di nyid zag pa med pa'i lam des rnam*[f] *par smin pa 'byin pa'i bag chags legs par bcom pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 70,10-11] [g] ***karmakṣayāya***[h] ***saṃvartate** 'syaiva kṛṣṇādikasya trividhasya sāsravasya karmaṇas tenānāsraveṇa karmaṇā vipākadāna-vāsanāsamudghātāt//*

"It is conducive to the extinction of *karman*", because through that *karman* without inflow the imprints that give rise to the ripening of exactly this threefold *karman* with inflow–black and so on–are completely eradicated.

[AS 59,11-13] [AS$_c$ (From ASBh 70,12-14): Pure and Impure *Karman*]

[AS$_c$ 680c11-13] 總約一切無漏業所有障礙[i]隨順體性。如其次第建立。曲穢濁等諸染污業。淨牟尼等諸清淨業.

[Addition by XUANZANG, corresponds to ASBh text below.][330]

---

a ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gnag*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gnas*.

b ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gcig*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *mtha' gcig*.

c ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *byang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *byang*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bya*.

d ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *mi mthun pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'gal ba'i*.

e ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *las las*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *las*.

f ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *rnam*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *rnams*.

g ASBh 70, n. 3: "Ms. inserts another *karma*."

h ASBh$_T$ *karmakṣayāya*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *karmakarmakṣayāya*.

i AS$_c$ 礙; AS$_c$ (CBETA ed.) 碍.

[ASBh 70,12-14] *Karman* without Inflow: Various Aspects, "Crookedness" etc.[331]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 63a3-4] *bye*[a] *brag med par zag pa med pa'i las 'di thams cad kyi bar du gcod pa dang rjes su mthun pa dang/ ngo bo nyid kyi dbang du byas nas yon po dang/ nyes pa dang/ rnyog pa dang/ gtsang*[b] *ba dang/ thub pa rnams go rim*[c] *bzhin du rnam par gzhag par rig*[d] *par bya'o//*

[ASBh 70,12-14] *aviśeṣeṇa ca sarvasyānāsravasya karmaṇaḥ paripantham ānukūlyaṃ svabhāva*[ASBh$_{MS}$ 63b]*m adhikṛtya vaṃkadoṣakaṣāyāṇāṃ śauceyānāṃ*[e] *mauneyānāṃ ca yathākramaṃ vyavasthānaṃ veditavyam//*

One should know that with reference to the adversary of, the conformity with and the nature of all *karman* without inflow indiscriminately, crookedness, fault and impurities, as well as purities and constitutive properties of the sages[332] are, respectively, established.[333]

[ASBh 70,15-16] "Crookedness": Explanation[334]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 63a4-5] *de la yon po ni lus dang ngag dang yid kyi las drang po'i lam 'phags pa'i lam yan lag brgyad pa 'byung ba'i sgrib*[f] *par gyur pa'o*[g]*//*

[ASBh 70,15-16] *tatra vaṃkam ṛjukamārgasyāṣṭāṅgasyotpattyāvaraṇabhūtaṃ kāyavāṅmanaḥkarma*[h]*/*

Among these, crookedness is the *karman* of body, speech and mind, which is an obstruction for the arising of the straight path that has eight limbs.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bye*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de'i phyir bye*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *gtsang*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *btsang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gtsang*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *rim*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *rims*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rims*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *gzhag par rig*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *gzhag par rigs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gzhag par rig*. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gzhag*.

[e] ASBh$_{T}$ *śauceyānāṃ*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *śauceyānaṃ*. ASBh 70, n. 4: "Ms. *naṃ*."

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *sgrib*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *sgrib*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bsgrib*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *gyur pa'o*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *'gyur pa'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'gyur ro*.

[h] ASBh$_{MS}$ *kāyavāṅmanaskarma*; ASBh$_{T}$ *kāyavāṅmanaḥkarma*.

[ASBh 70,16] "Fault": Explanation[335]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 63a5-6] *nyes pa ni lus la sogs pa'i las gang gis rnam par sun phyung ba'i*[a] *sems kyi*[b] *rgyud la de dang 'dra ba'i sgrib par gyur pa'i*[c] *las 'byung ba'o*[d]*//*

[ASBh 70,16] *doṣo yena kāyādikarmaṇā dūṣite*[e] *saṃtāne tat tādṛśam āvaraṇabhūtaṃ karmotpadyate/*

The fault is the *karman* of the body, and so on, through which such a *karman*, which is an obstruction, arises in the faulty [mental] continuum.

[ASBh 70,17-18] "Impurity": Explanation[336]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 63a6-7] *rnyog pa*[f] *ni mu stegs can gyi lta ba la brten pa'i lus la sogs pa'i las gang yin pa ste/ sangs rgyas kyi bstan pa la dad pa'i mi mthun pa'i phyogs ma dad pa'i rnyog pas*[g] *yongs su zin pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 70,17-18] *kaṣāyāḥ tīrthikadṛṣṭisaṃniśritaṃ*[h] *kāyādikarma*[i]*, buddhaśāsanaprasādavipakṣeṇāśraddhya kāluṣyaparigṛhītatvāt//*

The impurities are *karman* of the body, and so on, which is based on the [wrong] views of the Tīrthikas (i.e. non-Buddhists), because it is enclosed by the dirtiness of disbelief as the opposite to faith (*prasāda*) in the teaching of the Buddhas.[337]

[ASBh 70,18-19] "Crookedness": Alternative Explanation[338]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 63a7] *rnam grangs gzhan du na/ rtag pa dang/ chad pa'i mthar lhung*[j] *ste/ dbu ma'i lam dang mi mthun pa'i phyir yon po'o//*

An alternate explanation[339] is: [*karman*] that follows [the extremes of] eternalism or

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *phyung ba'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'byin pa'i*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *kyi*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *kyis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *kyi*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'gyur pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *'gyur pa'i*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *'byung ba'i*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *ba'o*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *ngo*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba'o*.

[e] ASBh 70, n. 5: "T. *vidūṣitacittasya* for *dūṣite*."

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ma*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *mas*.

[h] ASBh 70, n. 6: "Ms. adds *sat*."

[i] ASBh$_{T}$ *kāyādikarma*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *satkāyādikarma*.

[j] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *lhung*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *lhung ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *lhung*.

[ASBh 70,18-19] *aparaḥ paryāyaḥ śāśvatocchedānupatitaṃ madhyamāpratipadvi-rodhārthena vaṃkam/*

nihilism is called crookedness, because it is in opposition to the middle course of conduct.

[ASBh 70,19] "Fault": Alternative Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 63a7-8] *skur pa'i lta bas yongs su bzung ste*[a]*/ rnam par byang ba rnam par gzhag*[b] *pa la rab tu zhe sdang*[c] *ba'i phyir nyes pa'o//*

[ASBh 70,19] *apavādadṛṣṭiparigṛhītaṃ vyavadānavyavasthānapradveṣārthena dośaḥ/*

[*Karman* that is] under the sway of the [wrong] view of denial [is called] "fault" in the sense that it [involves] hatred towards the establishment of purification.

[ASBh 70,20] "Degeneration": Alternative Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 63a8-b1] *'jig tshogs la lta bas yongs su bzung*[d] *ste/ bdag med pa*[e] *kho na*[f] *la lta ba'i bar du gcod pa'i phyir rnyog pa*[g] *zhes bya'o//*

[ASBh 70,20] *satkāyadṛṣṭiparigṛhītaṃ nairātmya-tattvadarśanapratibaddhārthena*[h] *kaṣāya iti//*

[*Karman* that is] under the sway of the [wrong] view of belief in a "self"[340] [is called] "impurity" in the sense of being obstructed from seeing the reality (*tattva*) of non-self.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *bzung ste*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *gzung ste*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *bzung ste*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bzung ba*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *gzhag*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *bzhag*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gzhag*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,D}$ *zhe sdang*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *zhes sdang*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *sdang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *sdang*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *bzung*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *gzung*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *bzung*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gzung*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PN}$ *pa*; ASBh$_{t,GDC}$ *pa'i de*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *pa*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *pa de*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNDC}$ *na*; ASBh$_{t,G}$ *na nyid*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *na*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ma*.

[h] ASBh$_{T}$ *nairātmyatattvadarśanapratibaddhārthena*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *nairātmyatattvadaśanaprati-baddhārthena*.

[ASBh 70,21-23] "Purities": Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 63b1-2] *gtsang*[a] *ba ni shin tu rnam par dag pa'i tshul khrims kyis yongs su zin pa dang/ lta ba drang*[b] *pos yongs su zin pa'i lus dang ngag dang yid kyi las gang yin pa ste/ tshul khrims dang lta ba la*[c] *log par zhugs pa'i dri ma spangs pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 70,21-23] *śauceyāni suviśuddhaśīlasaṃgṛhītaṃ ṛjudṛṣṭisaṃgṛhītaṃ ca yat kāyavāṅmanaskarma, śīladṛṣṭivipattimalavarjitatvāt/*

"The purities" are the *karman* of body, speech and mind, which is included in perfectly pure discipline and in straight view, because the dirt of decayed discipline and views have been abandoned.

[ASBh 70,22-23] "Those of the Sages": Explanation[341]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 63b2-3] *thub pa pa*[d] *ni gang slob pa dang mi slob pa rnams kyi lus dang ngag dang yid kyi las zag pa med pa ste/ de thub pa rnams kyi las yin pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 70,22-23] *mauneyāni śaikṣāśaikṣāṇāṃ yad anāsravaṃ kāyavāṅmanaskarma*[e] *munīnāṃ*[f] *tatkarmeti kṛtvā//*

"Those of the sages" are the *karman* without inflow of body, speech and mind, of trainees and non-trainees,[342] in the sense "that [this] is the *karman* of the sages."

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *gtsang*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *btsang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gtsang*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *drang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *drag*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *ba la*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa la*.

[e] ASBh$_{MS}$ *kāyavāṅmanaskarma* (?); ASBh$_{T}$ *kāyavāṅmanaḥkarma*.

[f] ASBh$_{T}$ *munīnāṃ*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *mudīnāṃ*.

[AS 59,13-14] The Action of Giving: Various Aspects (Cause, Motivation, Object, Nature)[343]

[AS$_c$ 680c14-15] 復有施等諸清淨業。[344]云何施業。謂因緣故。等起故。處所故。自體故。分別施業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105b2-3] *sbyin pa'i las gang zhe na*[a]*/ de'i gzhi dang/ kun nas slong ba*[b] *dang/ dngos po dang/ ngo bo nyid kyis kyang*[c] *rig par bya ste/*

dānakarma katamat/ tan nidānataḥ samutthānato 'dhiṣṭhānataḥ svabhāvataś ca veditavyam/

What is the action of giving? It is to be understood through [its] cause, motivation,[345] basis, and also [its] nature.

[AS 59,14] "Cause": Definition

[AS$_c$ 680c15-16] 因緣者。謂無貪無瞋無癡善根。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105b3] *gzhi ni ma chags pa dang/ zhes sdang med pa dang/ gti mug med pa'o//*

nidānam alobho 'dveṣo 'mohaś ca/

Its cause is non-greed, non-hatred and non-delusion.

[AS 59,15] "Motivation": Definition[346]

[AS$_c$ 680c16] 等起者。謂彼俱行思。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105b3] *kun nas slong ba*[d] *ni de dag dang ldan pa'i sems pa'o*[e]*//*

samutthānaṃ tadsahagatā cetanā/

[Its] motivation is the intention that is accompanied by those.

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNGD}$ *slong ba*; AS$_{t,C}$ *spong ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *slong ba*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *slob pa*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *kyis kyang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *kyis*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *kyi*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *slong ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *slong ba*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *slob pa*.

[e] AS$_{t,DC}$ *sems pa'o*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *sems so*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *tshor ba'o*.

[AS 59,15] "Basis": Definition[347]

[AS$_c$ 680c16-17] 處所者。謂所施物。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105b3] *dngos po ni sbyin par bya ba'i dngos po'o//*

[Its] basis is the object to be given.

adhiṣṭhānaṃ deyaṃ vastu/

[AS 59,16] "Nature": Definition[348]

[AS$_c$ 680c17-18] 自體者。謂正行施時身語意業。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105b3-4] *ngo bo nyid ni gtong ba na*[a] *lus kyi las dang ngag gi*[b] *las so//*

svabhāvo tyāge kāyavākkarma//

[Its] nature is the action of body and speech[349] when one gives [the object] away.

[AS 59,16-17] Perfect Giving

[AS$_c$ 680c18-19] 云何施圓滿。謂數數施故。無偏黨施故。隨其所欲圓滿施故。施得圓滿。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105b4-5] *ji ltar na*[c] *sbyin pa phun sum tshogs pa yin zhe na*[d]*/ phyir zhing sbyin pa dang/ phyogs mi 'byed par sbyin*[e] *pa dang/ 'dod pa yongs su rdzogs par sbyin pa'i phyir ro//*

How is the perfection of giving [to be understood]? As constant giving, impartial giving and giving that completely fulfils the wishes.

kathaṃ dānasaṃpat/ ***abhīkṣṇadānato 'pakṣapātadānata icchāparipūraṇadānataś ca/***

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNDC}$ *gtong ba na*; AS$_{t,G}$ *gtong ba ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *stong pa na*.

[b] AS$_{t,DC}$ *gi*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *gis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gi*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ltar na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *ltar na*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *ltar*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *sbyin*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *sbyin*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *byin*.

[ASBh 70,23-24] "Perfect Giving": Quotation and Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 63b3] *sbyin*[a] *pa phun sum tshogs*[b] *pa'i dbang du byas nas*[c] *sbyin pa por 'gyur ro zhes bya ba 'dis ni phyir zhing sbyin pa ston te/ de'i ngang tshul can du gyur pas yang*[d] *dang yang sbyin pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 70,23-25] *dānasaṃpadam adhikṛtya dānaṃ dātā bhaviṣyatīty a'nenā**bhīkṣṇadānatāṃ** darśayati/ tacchīlatayā punaḥ punar dānāt/*

With reference to the perfection of giving, by means of the phrase "he will be a [regular] giver of gifts", [the sūtra] shows that he gives frequently, because having that as [his] habitual behaviour [he] gives again and again.

[ASBh 70,24-25] "To Ascetics, Brahmins ...": Quotation and Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 63b4] *dge sbyong rnams dang bram ze rnams la zhes bya ba*[e] *la sogs pas ni phyogs mi 'byed par sbyin pa ston te/ 'dod pa thams cad la bye brag med par sbyin pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 70,23-25] *śramaṇebhyo*[f] *brāhmaṇebhya ity evamādinā**pakṣapāta***[g]***dānatām**, aviśeṣe*[ASBh $_{MS}$ 64a]*ṇa sarvārthibhyo dānāt*[h]*/*

By [the words:] "To ascetics [and], Brahmins ...", and so on, [the sūtra teaches] that he gives impartially, because [one] gives without difference to all who want [something].[350]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *sbyin*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de dag ni sbyin*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNDC}$ *phun sum tshogs*; ASBh$_{t,G}$ *phun tshogs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *phun sum tshogs*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *nas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *par rig par bya ste/ de la*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *yang*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *yang dag*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yang*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *zhes bya ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gces pa*.

[f] ASBh$_T$ *śramaṇebhyo*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *śramaṇebhyo dānebhyo*. ASBh 70, n. 7: "Ms. adds *dānebhyo*."

[g] ASBh$_T$ *evamādināpakṣapātadānatām*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *evamādināpakṣapātaṃdanatām* (?). ASBh 70, n. 8: "Ms. *taṃ*."

[h] ASBh$_{MS}$ *dānāt*; ASBh$_T$ *dānāta*.

[ASBh 71,1-2] "Food and Drink ...": Quotation and Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 63b4-5] *bza' ba dang btung*[a] *ba zhes bya ba la sogs pas ni/ 'dod pa yongs su rdzogs par*[b] *sbyin pa ston te/ bsam pa ji lta ba bzhin du yo byad kyi dngos po*[c] *thams cad yongs su gtong ba'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 71,1-2] *annapānam ity evam-ādine*[d] ***cchāparipūraṇadānatām**, yathābhiprāyaṃ sarvopakaraṇavastuparityāgāt/*

By [the words:] "Food and drink", and so on, [the sūtra indicates] that he gives so as to completely fulfil all wishes, because he gives up all objects that are commodities [just] as [they are] aimed at.

[AS 59,17-19] Aspects of Giving: Unattached Giving, Extensive Giving, etc.[351]

[AS$_c$ 680c19-21] 又無所依施故。廣清淨施故。極歡喜施故。數數施故田器施故。善分布新舊施故。施得[e]圓滿

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105b5-6] *yang mi gnas par sbyin pa dang/ rgya cher sbyin pa dang/ dga' bas sbyin pa dang/ phyir zhing sbyin pa dang/ snod la sbyin pa dang/ 'khor dang/ glo bur du 'ongs pa la legs par bgos te/ sbyin pas sbyin pa phun sum tshogs par*[f] *rig par bya'o//*

*api khalu **aniśritadānato** viśadadānataḥ pramuditadānato 'bhīkṣṇadānataḥ pātradānataḥ parigrahāgantukasaṃvibhāgadānataś ca dāna-saṃpad veditvyā/*

Giving should also be understood to be perfect in so far as it is unattached giving,[352] extensive giving,[353] giving with joy,[354] frequent giving, giving to [an appropriate] vessel and giving by way of correctly distributing [the gifts] to one's kin and strangers.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,NGDC}$ *ba dang btung*; ASBh$_{t,P}$ *ba dang gtung*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba sbyin pa*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'i*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *po*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *po ma rul zhing dri ma med pa'i gzhi*.

[d] ASBh$_T$ °*ādine*°; ASBh$_{MS}$ °*ādinā ī*° (?).

[e] AS$_c$ 施得; AS$_c$ (宮 ed.) 得.

[f] AS$_{t,NDC}$ *par*; AS$_{t,PG}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *par*.

[ASBh 71,2-4] "Abandoning Freely, Stretching Out One's Hand ..." : Quotation and Explanation[355]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 63b5-7] *lhug par gtong ba dang/ lag*[a] *brkyang ba dang/ gtong ba la dga' ba dang/ mchod sbyin byed pa'i ngang tshul*[b] *can dang/ gtong*[c] *ba phun sum tshogs pa dang/ sbyin pa legs par 'gyed*[d] *pa la dga' ba zhes bya ba'i tshig*[e] *'di dag ni mi gnas par sbyin pa la sogs pa*[f] *dang go rim*[g] *bzhin du rig par bya'o// mi gnas pa'i*[h] *sbyin pa ni srid pa dang longs spyod kyi phyir yongs su mi bsngo*[i] *ba nyid du rig par bya'o//*

[ASBh 71,2-4] *muktatyāgaḥ* [j] *pratatapāṇir vyavasargarato yāyajūkas tyāgasaṃpanno dāne saṃ*[k]*vibhāgarata ity ebhiḥ padair yathākramam aniśritadānatādayo veditavyāḥ/* ***aniśritadānatā*** *punar bhava bhogāpariṇāmitatvena*[363] *veditavyā*[l]*//*

By the words "Abandoning freely,[356] stretching out one's hand,[357] delighting in giving away,[358] sacrificing constantly,[359] excellent abandoning,[360] when giving, he delights in distributing [the donation equally]"[361] – independent giving and so on are to be understood in due order. Unattached giving, in turn, is to be understood by the fact that it is not being dedicated to rebirth or wealth.[362]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *lag*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *lag pa*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ngąng tshul*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *ngang tshul*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *tshul*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gtong*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *sbyor*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *'gyed*; ASBh$_{t,D}$ *'ged*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *'god*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'gyed*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *bya ba'i tshig*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *bya'i tshig*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bya ba*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'i tshig*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *rim*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *rims*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *rim*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *rims*.

[h] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *par*.

[i] ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *bsngo*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *sngo*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bsngo*.

[j] ASBh 71, n. 1: "*muktatyāga* and the words that follow, see Mvt. Nos. 2844-48. Mvt. gives only five and not six as given here. Mvt. omits *tyāgasampannaḥ*."

[k] ASBh$_{MS}$ *dānesaṃ°*; ASBh$_{T}$ *dānasaṃ°*. ASBh 71, n. 2: "Ms. *ne*."

[l] ASBh$_{T}$ *veditavyā*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *veditavyāḥ*. ASBh 71, n. 3: "Ch. explains here *kṣetrabhājana*, *pratatapāṇi*, *yāyajūka*, *tyāgasampanna* and *dānasaṃvibhāgarata*."

[AS 59,19-21] The Perfect Gift: Various Criteria

[AS$_c$ 680c22-25] 云何應知施物圓滿。謂所施財物非誑詐得故。所施財物非侵他得故。所施財物非穢離[a]垢故。所施財物清淨故。所施財物如法所引故。如是應知施物圓滿。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105b6-7] *ji ltar na sbyin par bya ba phun sum tshogs par rig par bya zhe na*[b]*/ sbyin par bya ba'i dngos po gnod pas grub pa ma*[c] *yin pa dang/ sbyin par bya ba'i dngos po gzhan las phrogs pa ma yin pa dang/ sbyin par bya ba'i dngos po ma rul zhing dri ma med pa dang/ sbyin par bya ba'i dngos po rung ba dang/ sbyin par bya ba'i dngos po chos kyis bsgrubs*[d] *pa'i phyir ro//*

kathaṃ deyasaṃpadā veditavyā/ ***anabhidrugdha-deyavastutām aparāpahṛtadeyavastutām akuthitavimaladeyavastutāṃ kalpikadeyavastu-tāṃ dharmārjitadeyavastutāṃ copādāya/***

How is the perfection of the gift to be understood? The [gift is perfect] because the object to be given [has not been acquired through] misappropriation (/embezzlement), the object to be given [has not been acquired through] robbing it from others, that the object to be given is not stinking[364] and free from dirt, that the object to be given is appropriate, the object to be given has been procured in accordance with the Dharma.

[a] AS$_c$ 離; AS$_c$ (宋, 元, 明 eds.) 雜. Cf. AS$_c$ (中華 ed.) 離.

[b] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bya zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bya*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *bya'o*.

[c] AS$_{t,PGDC}$ *ma*; AS$_{t,N}$ *na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ma*.

[d] AS$_{t,DC}$ *bsgrubs*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bsgrub*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bsgrubs*. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *bsgrub*.

[ASBh 71,4-6] "Acquired through Motivated Effort": Quotation and Explanation[365]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 63b7-64a1] *sbyin par*[a] *bya ba phun sum tshogs pa'i dbang du byas nas ldang ba'i brtson 'grus kyis thob pa zhes bya ba*[b] *'dis ni sbyin par bya ba'i dngos po gnod pas grub pa ma yin pa ston te*[c]*/ gnod pas grub pa ni ldang*[d] *ba'i brtson 'grus kyis thob pa ma yin te/ rang gi*[e] *gnas na 'dug cing gzhan gyis bcol ba bsnyon*[f] *pas thob pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 71,4-6] *deyasaṃpadam adhikṛtyotthānavīryādhigatair ity*[g] *anenān*[h]***abhidrugdhadeyavastutāṃ*** *darśayati/ abhidrugdhaṃ hy anutthāna*[i]*vīryādhigataṃ bhavati/ svasthāne sthitvā parānikṣepā[pa] lapanena*[j] *pratilabdhatvāt/*

Concerning the perfect gift, by means of that [phrase] "acquired through motivated effort" [the sūtra] shows [that] the object to be given should not have been misappropriated (/ acquired through embezzlement). For, what has been acquired by misappropriation has not been acquired through motivated effort, because [it] is obtained by disowning what has been entrusted [to one] by others while staying in one's place.

---

a ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *par*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *par*.

b ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *ba*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *ba'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba*.

c ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *te*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *to*.

d ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *ldang*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *sdang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ldang*.

e ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *gi*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *gis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gi*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gis*.

f ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *bsnyon*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *bston*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bsnyon*.

g ASBh$_{T}$ °*gatair ity*; ASBh$_{MS}$ °*gataiḥ rity*.

h ASBh$_{T}$ *anenān*°; ASBh$_{MS}$ *anena ān*° (?).

i ASBh$_{T}$ *hy anutthāna*°; ASBh$_{MS}$ *hi +++na*°.

j ASBh$_{T}$ *parānikṣepā[pa]lapanena*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *parānikṣepālapanena*.

[ASBh 71,6-8] "Acquired with the Strength of One's Arm": Quotation and Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 64a1-2] *lag bdar*[a] *ba'i mthus bsgrubs*[b] *pa zhes bya ba 'dis ni/ sbyin par bya ba'i dngos po gzhan las phrogs pa ma yin pa ston to// gzhan las*[c] *phrogs pa ni lag bdar*[d] *ba'i mthus bsgrubs*[e] *pa ma yin te/ de dag gis*[f] *sha thang bar thabs sna tshogs kyis bsgrubs pa*[g] *phrogs pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 71,6-8] *bāhubalopārjitair ity anenā**parāpahṛtadeyavastutām**/ parebhyo hy apahṛtaṃ na bāhubalopārjitaṃ bhavati, taiḥ kṛcchreṇa vividhair upāyair arjitasyāpaharaṇāt/*

Through the [phrase] "acquired with the strength of one's arm" [he shows that] the thing to be given is not stolen from another. For what is stolen from another is not acquired with the strength of one's arm, because one steals it [something that has been] acquired by them with difficulty through various means.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *bdar*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *dar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dar*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bsgrubs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bsgrubs*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *bsgrub*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *las*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *las*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *la*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *bdar*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *dar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dar*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *bsgrubs*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *bsgrub*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bsgrubs*.

[f] *gis*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gi*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *pa*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *pa pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[ASBh 71,8-9] "Thrown off Sweat and Dirt": Quotation and Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 64a2-3] *rngul dang dri mas ma phog*[a] *pa zhes bya ba 'dis ni sbyin par bya ba'i dngos po ma rul cing*[b] *dri ma med pa ston te*[c]*/ rngul*[d] *dang dri mas ma phog pa zhes bya ba ni spangs*[e] *zhes bya ba'i tha tshig go//*

[ASBh 71,8-9] *svedamalā*[f]*pakṣiptair ity anena* ***akuthitavimaladeyavastutām****, svedamalābhyām apakṣiptatvād ujjhitatvād ity arthaḥ/*

Through that [phrase] "deserted (lit. thrown off) by sweat and dirt" [he shows that] the thing to be given is not stinking and free from dirt, "because it is deserted by sweat and dirt, the meaning is "because [it is] abandoned".[366]

[ASBh 71,9-10] "In Accordance with the Dharma": Quotation and Explanation[367]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 64a3-4] *chos dang mthun pa zhes bya ba 'dis ni sbyin par bya ba'i dngos po rung ba ston te/ mtshon cha*[g] *dang dug dang chang la sogs pa rung ba ma*[h] *yin pa'i dngos po yongs su spangs pa'i*[i] *phyir ro//*

[ASBh 71,9-10] *dhārmikair ity anena* ***kalpika***[j]***deyavastutām****, śastraviṣayamadyādya-kalpikavastuvivarjitatvāt/*

By the [expression] "in accordance with the Dharma (*dhārmika*)"[368] [he] indicates that the object to be given is appropriate,[369] because unworthy objects, like weapons, poison, liquor, and so on,[370] are avoided.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,GDC}$ *phog*; ASBh$_{t,P}$ *phrog*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *phrogs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *phog*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *phogs*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *cing*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *cing*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *zhing*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ston te*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ston pa ste*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rngul* (graphically identical to *rdul*). Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *rngul*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *rul*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *spangs*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *spongs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *spangs*.

[f] ASBh$_T$ *svedamalā*°; ASBh$_{MS}$ *svedamalamā*°; ASBh 71, n. 4: "Ms. °*lamā*° for °*lā*°, cf. Mvt. No. 7055."

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *mtshon cha*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *mtshon*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *mtshon cha*.

[h] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *ba ma*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *ba* (one graph erased between *ba* and *yin*). Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba ma*.

[i] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *spangs pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *spang ba'i*.

[j] ASBh$_T$ *kalpika*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *kalpi+ka*. ASBh 71, n. 5: "Ms. *kalpitaka* (?). Mvt. No. 9196 supports our reading."

[ASBh 71,10-12] "Attained in Accordance with the Dharma": Quotation and Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 64a4-5] *chos kyis thob pa zhes bya ba 'dis ni/ sbyin par bya ba'i dngos po chos kyis*[a] *bsgrubs pa ston te*[b]*/ gzhal ba la*[c] *g.yo*[d] *'jug pa la sogs pa dang log pas 'tsho ba la sogs pa yongs su spangs pas*[e] *bsgrubs pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 71,10-12] *dharmalabdhair ity anena* ***dharmārjitadeyavastutāṃ*** *darśayati/ tulākūṭādimithyājīva*[f] [ASBh$_{MS}$ 64b] *parivarjanenopārjitatvāt//*

By the [expression] "attained in accordance with the Dharma" [he] indicates that the object to be given has been procured in accordance with the Dharma, because it has been procured while completely avoiding wrong livelihood, such as cheating with the balance,[371] and so on.[372]

[AS 60,1-2] [AS$_c$: Sūtra Quotation on the Discipline of a Monk][373]

[AS$_c$ 680c26-28] 如契經說。成就尸羅。善能防護別解脫律儀。軌則所行皆悉圓滿。見微細罪生大怖畏。於諸學處善能受學。

[Sūtra quotation, added by XUANZANG: "As the sūtra says: He is furnished with discipline. He holds the Prātimokṣa restraints well. His manners and the places he goes are all of integrity. When he sees a tiny sin, great dread arises. In all the subjects of training, he takes [upon himself] the training well."]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *kyis*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *kyi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *kyis*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *te*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *to*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *las*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *g.yo*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *g.yo*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *g.yong*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *pas*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *nas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pas*.

[f] *tulākūṭādi°*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *tulākū+ ādi°*; ASBh$_T$ *tulākūlādi°*. ASBh 71, n. 6: "T. adds *ādi*."

[AS 60,2-3] "Someone Who has Discipline": Explanation[374]

[AS$_{c}$ 680c28-29] 云何成就尸羅。能受能護淨尸羅故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105b8] *ji ltar na tshul khrims dang ldan pa yin zhe na*[a]*/ yang dag par blangs pa'i tshul khrims rjes su srung*[b][376] *ba'i phyir ro//*

How is he someone who has discipline? Because [he] keeps the discipline[375] he has taken up.

kathaṃ śīlavān ***bhavati****/ samādattaśīlānurakṣaṇatām*[377] *upādāya/*

[ASBh 71,13] "Someone Who has Discipline": Further Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 64a5-6] *tshul khrims yang dag par blangs nas ma nyams pas*[c] *de dang ldan pa'i phyir tshul khrims dang ldan pa yin no//*

Because, having taken up the discipline, [he remains] united with it, without breaking [it], he is someone who has discipline.

[ASBh 71,13] [§75] *śīlaṃ samādāyākhaṇḍanena tadyogāc* ***chīlavān*** *bhavati/*

[AS 60,3-4] "Restrained by the Prātimokṣa Restraint": Explanation[378]

[AS$_{c}$ 680c29-681a1] 云何善能防護別解脫律儀。能善護持出離尸羅故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 105b8-106a1] *ji ltar na so sor*[d] *thar pa'i sdom pas bsdams*[e] *pa yin zhe na*[f]*/ nges par 'byin pa'i tshul khrims yin pa'i phyir ro//*

How is [he] restrained by the Prātimokṣa restraint?[379] Because he has the discipline that is conducive to deliverance.

kathaṃ ***prātimokṣasaṃvara****saṃvṛto bhavati/*[380] *nairyāṇikaśīlatām*[381] *upādāya/*

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[b] AS$_{t,DC}$ *srung*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bsrung*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bsrung*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pas* . Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *pas*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *pa'i*.

[d] AS$_{t,NGDC}$ *sor*; AS$_{t,P}$ *so*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *sor*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *so*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bsdams*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bsdams*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *bsdoms*.

[f] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[ASBh 71,14] "Restrained by the Prātimokṣa Restraint": Further Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 64a6] *thar pa'i phyir sdom pa gang yin pa de ni so sor thar pa'i sdom pa ste/ de ni 'khor ba las*[a] *'byung bar 'gyur ba*[b] *yin no//*

[ASBh 71,14] *mokṣaṃ prati yaḥ saṃvaraḥ sa* ***prātimokṣasaṃvaraḥ****/ sa hi saṃsārān niryāṇāya bhavati/*

That which is a restraint towards liberation is a Prātimokṣa restraint. After all, it is for deliverance (*niryāṇa*) from *saṃsāra*.[382]

[AS 60,4-5] "Excellent in Conduct and Location": Explanation[383]

[AS$_c$ 681a1-2] 云何軌則所行皆悉圓滿。具淨尸羅難為毀責故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106a1] *ji ltar na cho ga dang spyod yul phun sum tshogs pa yin zhe na*[c]*/ ma smad pa'i tshul khrims yin pa'i phyir ro//*

katham ***ācāragocarasaṃpanno*** *bhavati/ avigarhitaśīlatvām upādāya/.*

How is he excellent in conduct and location? Because he has discipline without reproach.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *las*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *las nges par*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bar 'gyur ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[ASBh 71,15-17] "Excellent in Conduct and Location": Further Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 64a6-8] *cho ga phun sum tshogs pa ni spyod lam la sogs pa dam pa rnams kyis ma smad pa'i phyir ro// spyod yul phun sum tshogs pa ni spyod yul ma yin pa lnga spangs pa'i phyir te/ dge slong gi spyod*[a] *yul ma yin pa lnga ni gsod pa'i sa dang/ smad 'tshong gi*[b] *gnas dang/ chang 'tshong gi*[c] *khyim dang/ rgyal po'i pho brang dang/ gdol pa'i khyim ste lnga po'o*[d]*//*

[ASBh 71,15-17] ***ācārasampannaḥ*** *sadbhir agarhiteryāpathāditvāt/* ***gocarasampannaḥ*** *pañcāgocaraparivarja*[e]*nāt/ pañca bhikṣor agocarāḥ/ ghoṣo*[f] *veśaḥ pānāgāraṃ rājakulaṃ caṇḍālakaṭhinam*[g] *eva pañcamam/*

He is excellent in conduct. Because his deportment and so on are not criticized by good men.[384] He is excellent in location.[385] Because he completely avoids the five forbidden locations. The five forbidden locations of a monk are a place of slaughter,[386] a brothel,[387] a tavern, a royal court[388] and a *caṇḍala*'s hut.[389]

[AS 60,5-6] "He Dreads even the Tiniest Vice": Explanation

[AS$_c$ 681a2-3] 云何見微細罪生大怖畏。勇猛恭敬所學尸羅故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106a1-2] *ji ltar na kha na ma tho ba chung ngu tsam rnams la yang 'jigs*[h] *par lta*[i] *ba yin zhe na*[j]*/ shin tu gus par slob pa'i tshul khrims yin pa'i phyir ro//*

katham ***anumātreṣv avadyeṣu bhayadarśī bhavati/ tīvragauravaśikṣaṇaśī****latām upādāya/*

How does he perceive a danger in even the tiniest vices (*avadyāḥ*)?[390] Because he has a discipline that is being trained with utmost earnestness.[391]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *spyod*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *spyod*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *skyod*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ma'i*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ma'i*.

[d] *po'o*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *lnga'o*.

[e] ASBh 71, n. 7: "Ms. *rji*."

[f] ASBh 71, n. 8: "Ch. 'place of music' or 'singing'; T. 'place of Killing'."

[g] ASBh 71, n. 9: "For kaṭhina, T. 'house'."

[h] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *jigs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *jigs*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *jig*.

[i] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *lta*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *blta*.

[j] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[ASBh 71,17-18] "He Dreads even the Tiniest Vice": Further Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 64a8-b1] *bcas pa'i kha na ma tho ba rnams dang rang bzhin gyi kha na ma tho ba rnams la yang bsam pa drag pos bslab*[a] *pas kha na ma tho ba chung ngu tsam rnams la yang 'jigs par lta ba yin no//*

[ASBh 71,17-18] *prajñaptisāvadyeṣv api prakṛti-sāvadyeṣv iva* ***tīvreṇa gauraveṇa śikṣaṇād anu-mātreṣv avadyeṣu bhayadarśī bhavati/***

He has become someone who perceives a danger in even the tiniest vices, because he trains with utmost earnestness even with regard to the vices [which have been] declared [by the Bhagavat], [just] as with regard to the vices [which are blameworthy] by nature.

[AS 60,6] "He Trains in the Properly Acquired Bases of Training": Explanation

[AS$_c$ 681a3-4] 云何於諸學處善能受學。圓滿受學所學尸羅故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106a2-3] *ji ltar na yang dag par blangs pa la slob ce na*[b]*/ bslab pa'i gzhi*[c] *rnams la bslab pa yongs su rdzogs par slob pa'i tshul khrims yin pa'i phyir ro//*

katham samādāya ***śikṣate śikṣāpadeṣu***[392]*/ pari-pūrṇaśikṣāśikṣaṇaśīlatām*[393] *upādāya/*

How does he train having taken up the bases of training? Because his discipline is one of training the training completely.

[ASBh 71,18-19] "He Trains in the Properly Acquired Bases of Training": Further Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 64b1-2] *kun nas yongs su rdzogs par bslab pa rnams blangs nas slob pa'i phyir yang dag par blangs te bslab pa'i gzhi rnams la slob ces bya'o*[d]*//*

[ASBh 71,18-19] *samantāt* ***paripūrṇaṃ śikṣām*** *ādāya* ***śikṣate śikṣāpadeṣv*** *ity ucyate//*

It is said that he trains in the issues of training after acquiring the training in every respect completely.[394]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNDC}$ *bslab*; ASBh$_{t,G}$ *bslabs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *slob*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *slob ce na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *slob*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *gzhi*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *gzhi'i gnas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gzhi*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bya'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *brjod do*.

[AS 60,7-8] [AS$_c$ (From ASBh 71,20-21): "Discipline" Refers to "Restrained with Body and Speech"]

[AS$_c$ 681a5] 從是已後依止尸羅。釋佛經中護身等義。

[Addition by XUANZANG, inserted from ASBh 71,20-21 (see below).][395]

[ASBh 71,20-21] Explanation: "Discipline" Refers to "Restrained with Body and Speech"[396]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 64b2-3] *'di man chad du ni tshul khrims las brtsams[a] nas/*[397] *bcom ldan 'das kyis[b] mdo sde gzhan dag las[c] lus dang ngag[d] bsdams pa yin no zhes bya ba la sogs pa gang bstan pa de'i don brjod par bya'o//*

[ASBh 71,20-21] [§76] *ataḥ paraṃ śīlam ārabhya yad bhagavatā sūtrāntareṣu nirdiṣṭaṃ kāyena saṃvṛto bhavatīty evamādi tasyārtha ucyate/*

Hereafter, having begun with discipline, the meaning of what has been pointed out by the Bhagavat in other sūtras, [i.e.] "he is restrained with body and speech", [398] and so on, is explained.

[AS 60,8] "Restrained with Body and Speech": Explanation[399]

[AS$_c$ 681a5-6] 云何名爲防護身語。由彼正解所攝持故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106a3] *ji ltar na lus dang ngag gis bsdams[e] pa yin zhe na[f]/ shes bzhin gyis yongs su zin pa'i phyir ro//*

katham ***kāyena vācā saṃvṛto bhavati/ saṃprajanyaparigṛhītatvāt//***

How is he restrained with body and speech? Because he is possessed of awareness.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *brtsams*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *brtsam pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *brtsams*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *kyis*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *kyi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *kyis*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gzhan dag las*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gzhan du*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ngag*; Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *ngag gi*; Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *ngag gis*.

[e] AS$_{t,DC}$ *bsdams*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *gdams*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gi kun tu spyod pa bsdam*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gi kun tu spyod pa bsdams*.

[f] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[ASBh 71,21-22] "Restrained with Body and Speech": Further Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 64b3-4] *de la lus dang ngag gis bsdams*[a] *pa yin pa ni shes bzhin gyis yongs su zin pa*[b] *yin pa'i phyir te/ ji ltar bka' stsal pa*[c] *bzhin du 'gro ba dang/ ldog pa la sogs pa la blo sngon du btang nas legs par*[d] *bsgrub*[e] *pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 71,21-22] *tatra* ***kāyena vācā saṃvṛto bhavati saṃprajanyaparigṛhītatayā*** *yathānujñātam*[f] *abhikramapratikramādiṣu buddhipūrvaṃ samyagvartanāt/*

He is restrained with body and speech because he is possessed of awareness. Because in the case of advancing, returning and so on,[400] he proceeds correctly,[401] considerately (*buddhipūrvam*), in accordance with what [the Buddha][402] has prescribed.

[AS 60,9] "Excellent through Excellence of Body and Speech": Explanation[403]

[AS$_c$ 681a6-7] 云何身語具足圓滿。終不毀犯所毀犯故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106a3-4] *ji ltar na lus dang ngag phun sum tshogs pas phun*[g] *sum tshogs pa yin zhe na*[h]*/ ltung ba mi byed*[i] *ba'i phyir ro//*

kathaṃ ***kāyavāksaṃpattyā saṃpanno*** *bhavati/* ***āpattyanadhyāpannatayā/***

How is he excellent through excellence of body and speech? Because he does not commit offences.

---

[a] *gis bsdams*; ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *gi bsdams*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *gi bsdoms*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *pa*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *pa'i*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bka' stsal pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gnang ba*; ASVy$_{t,PG}$ *snang ba*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *par*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *pa la*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PG}$ *bsgrub*; ASBh$_{t,NDC}$ *bsgrubs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bsgrubs*.

[f] ASBh$_{MS}$ *yathānujñātam*; ASBh$_T$ *yathanujñātam*.

[g] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *phun sum tshogs pas phun*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *phun*.

[h] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[i] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba mi byed*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bas mi gnod*.

[ASBh 72,1] "Excellent through Excellence of Body and Speech": Further Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 64b4] *lus dang ngag phun sum tshogs pas phun sum tshogs pa ni ltung ba mi byed pa'i phyir te/ tshul khrims chud mi gson pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 72,1] ***kāyavāksaṃpattyā saṃpanna***[a][406] ***āpattyanadhyāpannatayā***[b] *śīlāvipādanāt/*

He is excellent through excellence of body and speech because he does not commit a offences.[404] Because he does not break[405] the discipline.

[AS 60,9-11] "Completely Pure Conduct of Body and Speech": Explanation[407]

[AS$_c$ 681a7-9] 云何身語清淨現行。由無悔等漸次修行。乃至得定爲依止故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106a4] *ji ltar na lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa yongs su dag pa*[c] *yin zhe na*[d]*/ 'gyod pa med pa la sogs pa'i*[e] *rim gyis ting nge 'dzin gyi bar*[f] *la gnas pa'i phyir ro//*

katham ***pariśuddhakāyavāksamudācāro*** *bhavati/ avipratisārādikrameṇa*[409] ***samādhisaṃniśrayatayā***/[410]

How is his conduct of body and speech purified? Because his conduct is based on concentration [obtained] through the successive steps starting with absence of regret.[408]

---

[a] *saṃpanna*; ASBh$_{T,MS}$ *saṃpannaḥ*.

[b] ASBh$_T$ °*āpannatayā*; ASBh$_{MS}$ °*āpadanatayā*. ASBh 72, n. 1: "T. *anāpatteḥ*, Ch. *āpadyamavipādanatayā* (It does not break the breakable) for *āpattyanadhyāpannatayā*."

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa yongs su dag pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PND}$ *pa dag*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PND}$ *pa*.

[f] AS$_{t,D}$ *'dzin gyi bar*; AS$_{t,C}$ *'dzin gyi rang*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *'dzin*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,ND}$ *'dzin gyi bar*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *'dzin* (letter erased) *gyi bar*.

[ASBh 72,1-2] "Completely Pure Conduct of Body and Speech": Further Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 64b4-5] *lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa yongs su dag pa ni ting nge*[a] *'dzin la gnas pa'i phyir te/ ting nge 'dzin gyi stobs kyis 'chal pa'i tshul khrims kyi dri*[b] *ma thag bsring*[411] *ba'i phyir ro*[c]*//*

[ASBh 72,1-2] ***pariśuddhakāya vāksamudācāraḥ samādhisaṃniśrayatayā*** *samādhibalena dauḥ-śīlyamaladūrīkaraṇāt/*

His conduct of body and speech is purified because he remains in concentration. Because he makes distant (*dūrīkaraṇa*) the dirt of bad discipline through the power of concentration.

[AS 60,11-12] "Wholesome Conduct of Body and Speech": Explanation[412]

[AS$_c$ 681a9-10] 云何身語極善現行。染污尋思所不雜[d]故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106a5] *ji ltar na lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa dge ba yin zhe na*[e]*/ nyon mongs pa can gyi rtog pa dang ma 'dres pa'i phyir ro//*

kathaṃ ***kāyavāksamudācāraḥ kuśalo***[413] *bhavati/* ***kliṣṭavitarkāvyavakīrṇa****tayā/*

How is his conduct of body and speech wholesome? Because it is not mixed with defiled reflection.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *ting nge*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *ting*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *dri*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *gri*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PND}$ *dri*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *ro*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *te*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PND}$ *ro*.

[d] AS$_c$ 雜; AS$_c$ (宋, 元, 明, 宮 eds.) 離. Cf. AS$_c$ (中華 ed.) 雜.

[e] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[ASBh 72,3-4] "Wholesome Conduct of Body and Speech": Further Explanation

[$ASBh_{t,P}$ 64b5-6] *lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa dge ba ni nyon mongs pa can gyi rtog pa dang ma 'dres pa'i phyir te// gcig tu dge ba'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 72,3-4] ***kuśala[kāya]vāk***[a] ***samudā***[$ASBh_{MS}$ 65a]***cāraḥ kliṣṭavitarkāvyavakīrṇa*** [b] ***tayaikānta-śubhatvāt/***

His conduct of body and speech is wholesome because it is not mixed with defiled reflection. Because it is exclusively pure.

[AS 60,12-13] "Conduct of Body and Speech Without Vice": Explanation[414]

[AS_c 681a10-11] 云何身語無罪現行。遠離邪願修梵行故。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 106a5-6] *ji ltar na lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa kha na ma tho ba med pa yin zhe na*[c]*/ smon*[d] *nas tshangs par spyod la gnas pa rnam par spangs pa'i phyir ro//*

katham ***anavadyakāyavāksamudācāro*** *bhavati/ praṇidhāyabrahmacaryavāsavivarjitatayā/*

How is his conduct of body and speech blameless?[415] Because he has given up the life of an ascetic celibacy out of aspiration[416] [for worldly matters].

[ASBh 72,4-5] "Conduct of Body and Speech without Vice": Further Explanation

[$ASBh_{t,P}$ 64b6-7] *lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa kha na ma tho ba med pa ni srid pa dang*[e] *longs spyod kyi phyir yongs su mi bsngo bas dam pa rnams kyis bsngags pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 72,4-5] ***anavadyakāyavāksamudācāro*** *bhavabhogāpariṇāmitatvena sadbhiḥ praśasta-tvāt/*

His conduct of body and speech is without vice because it is not dedicated to [a better] rebirth or wealth (*bhoga*). Because [such a conduct] is praised[417] by the good men.[418]

---

[a] $ASBh_T$ *kuśala[kāya]vāk*; $ASBh_{MS}$ *kuśalavāk*.

[b] $ASBh_T$ °*vyavakīrṇa*°; $ASBh_{MS}$ °*vyavatīrṇa*°.

[c] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[d] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *smon*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,P}$ *smon*; $ASVy_{t,D}$ *de smon*.

[e] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa dang*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[AS 60,13-14] "Conduct of Body and Speech free from Harm": Explanation[419]

[AS_c 681a11-12] 云何身語無害現行。不輕陵他易共住故。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 106a6] *ji ltar na lus dang ngag*[a] *gi kun tu spyod pa gnod pa med pa yin zhe na*[b]*/ gzhan la brnyas thabs mi byed cing 'grogs na bde ba'i phyir ro//*

katham ***avyābadhyakāyavāksamudācāro*** *bhavati/ pareṣām aparapaṃsanasukhasaṃvāsanatayā/*

How is his conduct of body and speech free from harm? Because he does not disparage others and because it is pleasant to stay with him.

[ASBh 72,5-6] "Conduct of Body and Speech free from Harm": Further Explanation

[$ASBh_{t,P}$ 64b7-8] *lus dang ngag kyi kun tu spyod pa gnod pa med pa ni bdag la bstod pa la sogs pas*[c] *gzhan dag*[d] *khyad*[e] *du gsod cing 'grogs na mi bde bas zher 'debs pa med pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 72,5-6] ***avyābadhyakāyavāksamudācāra*** *ātmotkarṣaṇādibhiḥ pareṣām avajñāduḥkha saṃvāsenāghaṭṭanāt/*

His conduct of body and speech is free from harm because he does not, by extolling himself, etc., hurt others through disrespect. Because it is not unpleasant to stay with him.

---

[a] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *ngag*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *ngag dang yid.*

[b] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na.* Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *yin.*

[c] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *pas*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,D}$ *pas*; $ASVy_{t,P}$ *pa*.

[d] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *gzhan dag*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *gzhan.*

[e] $ASBh_{t,PNGD}$ *khyad*; $ASBh_{t,C}$ *khyab*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *khyad.*

[AS 60,14-15] "Conducive Conduct of Body and Speech": Explanation[420]

[AS$_c$ 681a12-13] 云何身語隨順現行。由能隨順涅槃得故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106a7] *ji ltar na lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa rjes su mthun pa yin zhe na*[a]*/ mya ngan las 'das pa 'thob*[b] *par byed pa dang mthun pa'i phyir ro//*

katham ***ānulomikakāyavāksamudācāro*** *bhavati/* ***nirvāṇānuprāptyanukūlatayā/***

How is his conduct of body and speech conducive?[421] Because it is favourable for attaining *nirvāṇa*.

[ASBh 72,6-7] "Conducive Conduct of Body and Speech": Further Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 64b8] *lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa rjes su mthun pa ni mya ngan las 'das pa thob*[c] *par byed pa dang mthun pa'i phyir te/ 'phags pa'i lam 'dren pa'i*[d] *phyir ro//*

[ASBh 72,6-7] ***ānulomikakāyavāksamudācāro nirvāṇānuprāptyanukūlatayā****rya mārgāvāhanāt/*

His conduct of body and speech is conducive because it is favourable for attaining *nirvāṇa*. Because it entails the Noble Path.

[AS 60,15-16] "Appropriate Conduct of Body and Speech": Explanation[422]

[AS$_c$ 681a13] 云何身語隨隱顯現行。隱善顯惡故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106a7-8] *ji ltar na lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa rjes su 'byor ba yin zhe na*[e]*/ dge ba mi spyoms*[f][424] *pa dang/ sdig pa mi 'chab pa'i phyir ro//*

katham ***ānucchavikakāyavāksamudācār****o bhavati/ praticchannakalyāṇavivṛtapāpatayā/*

How is his conduct of body and speech appropriate?[423] Because it does not exhibit his good [deeds] and conceal his bad [deeds].

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *'thob*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *thob*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'thob*.

[c] *'thob*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *thob*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'thob*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *lam 'dren pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *lam la gzhol ba'i*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[f] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *spyoms*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *spyom*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *bcom*.

[ASBh 72,7-8] "Appropriate Conduct of Body and Speech": Further Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 64b8-65a1] *lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa rjes su 'byor*[a] *ba ni rang gi nyes pa dang*[b] *yon tan sgrogs pa dang mi spyoms*[c] *pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 72,7-8] ***anucchavikakāyavāksamudācāraḥ*** *sva*[T. 65a]*doṣaguṇā viṣkaraṇa*[d] *chādanārthena*[e] /[426]

"His conduct of body and speech is appropriate" in so far as that he discloses his own faults and conceals [his own] virtues.[425]

[AS 60,16-17] " Suitable Conduct of Body and Speech": Explanation[427]

[AS$_c$ 681a13-14] 云何身語親善現行。同梵行者攝受尸羅故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106a8-b1] *ji ltar na lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa thabs dang ldan pa yin zhe na*[f]*/ tshangs pa mtshungs*[g] *par spyod pa nye bar bsdud*[h] *pa'i tshul khrims yin pa'i phyir ro//*

katham ***aupayikakāyavāksamudācāro*** *bhavati/* ***sa-brahmacāryupagrahaṇaśīlatayā/***

How is his conduct of body and speech suitable?[428] Because his discipline is such that it attracts [his] fellow ascetics.[429]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *rjes su 'byor*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *'byor*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa dang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa mthol zhing*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *grogs pa dang mi spyoms*; ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'chab*.

[d] *°āviṣkaraṇa°*; ASBh$_{T,MS}$ *°āviṣkambhaṇa°*.

[e] *°ārthena*; ASBh$_{T,MS}$ *°ārtham*.

[f] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[g] AS$_{t,PGDC}$ *mtshungs*; AS$_{t,N}$ *tshungs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *mtshungs*.

[h] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bsdud*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *sdud*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *sdud*.

[ASBh 72,8-9] " Suitable Conduct of Body and Speech": Further Explanation

[$ASBh_{t,P}$ 65a1-2] *lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa thabs dang ldan pa ni tshangs pa mtshungs par spyod pa nye bar sdud pa'i tshul khrims yin pa'i phyir te/ nye bar 'gro bar*[a] *bya ba'i 'os yin pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 72,8-9] ***au*[b] *payikakāyavāksamudācāraḥ*** *sabrahmacāryupagrahaṇaśīla tayopagamanārhatvāt*[c]*/*

His conduct of body and speech is suitable because his discipline attracts [his] fellow ascetics.[430] Because [due to his conduct] he is worthy to be approached.[431]

[AS 60,17-18] "Proper Conduct of Body and Speech": Explanation[432]

[AS_c 681a14-15] 云何身語應現行。於尊尊位離憍慢故。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 106b1] *ji ltar*[d] *na lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa 'tsham pa*[434] *yin zhe na*[e]*/ bla ma rnams dang/ bla ma rnams*[f] *dang 'dra ba rnams la nga rgyal bcag pa'i phyir ro//*

katham ***pratirūpakāyavāksamudācāro*** *bhavati/* ***guruṣu gurusthānīyeṣu ca nihatamānatayā/***

How is the conduct of body and speech proper? Because he has destroyed conceit towards the masters and those representing the masters.[433]

---

[a] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *bar*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,P}$ *bar*; $ASVy_{t,D}$ *ba'i*.

[b] $ASBh_T$ *au*; $ASBh_{MS}$ looks like *ā* (?).

[c] $ASBh_T$ °*cāryupagrahaṇaśīlatayopagamanārhatvāt*; $ASBh_{MS}$ °*caryupagrahaṇaśīlatayā upagamanārhatvāt* (?).

[d] $AS_{t,NDC}$ *ltar*; $AS_{t,PG}$ *lta*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *ltar*.

[e] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[f] $AS_{t,PNG}$ *ma rnams*; $AS_{t,DC}$ *ma*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *ma*.

[ASBh 72,9-10] "Proper Conduct of Body and Speech": Further Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 65a2-3] *lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa 'tsham pa*[a] *ni bla ma rnams dang bla ma dang 'dra ba rnams la nga rgyal bcag pa'i phyir te/ ci rigs su bsnyen bkur byed pa'i*[b] *phyir ro//*

[ASBh 72,9-10] ***pratirūpakāyavāksamudācāro*** ***guruṣu gurusthānīyeṣu ca nihitamānatayā*** [c] *yathārham upacaraṇāt/*

His conduct of body and speech is proper because he has destroyed conceit towards the masters and those representing the masters. Because he approaches them with due respect.

[AS 60,18-19] "Respectful Conduct of Body and Speech": Explanation[435]

[AS$_c$ 681a15-16] 云何身語敬順現行。於尊教誨敬順受故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106b1-2] *ji ltar na lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa mthun pa yin zhe na*[d]*/ gdams ngag la mthun*[e] *par 'dzin pa'i phyir ro//*

*katham **pradakṣiṇakāyavāksamudācāro** bhavati/ avadāde pradakṣiṇagrāhitayā/*

How is his conduct of body and speech respectful (*pradakṣiṇa*)? Because he receives the instruction respectfully.

[ASBh 72,10-11] "Respectful Conduct of Body and Speech": Further Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 65a3] *lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa mthun pa ni gdams*[f] *ngag la mthun par 'dzin pa'i phyir te/ rang gi lta ba la mchog tu 'dzin*[g] *pa med pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 72,10-11] ***pradakṣiṇakāyavāksamudācāro*** *'vadāde pradakṣiṇa grāhitayā 'svayaṃdṛṣṭi-parāmarśatvāt/*

How is his conduct of body and speech respectful? Because he follows the instruction respectfully. Because he does not cling to his own [wrong] views.[436]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *'tsham pa*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *'tshams med pa.*

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'i.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa yin pa'i.*

[c] *nihatamānatayā*; ASBh$_{T,MS}$ *nihitamānatayā.*

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin.*

[e] AS$_{t,PNDC}$ *mthun*; AS$_{t,G}$ *'thun.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *mthun.*

[f] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *gdams*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *gdam.*

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *'dzin*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *d'dzin.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'dzin.*

[AS 60,19-20] "Untormented Conduct of Body and Speech": Explanation[437]

[AS$_{c}$ 681a16-17] 云何身語無熱現行。遠離苦行熱惱下劣欲解故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106b2-3] *ji ltar na lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa gdung ba med pa yin zhe na*[a]*/ dka' thub drag po dang/ ngan ngon la mos pa rnam par spangs pa'i phyir ro//*

katham ***ataptakāyavāksamudācāro*** *bhavati/* ***kaṣṭatapolūhādhimuktivivarjitatayā/***

How is his conduct of body and speech untormented? Because he has avoided all violent asceticism and adherence[438] to what is miserable.[439]

[ASBh 72,11-12] "Untormented Conduct of Body and Speech": Further Explanation[440]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 65a3-4] *lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa gdung ba med pa ni dka' thub drag po dang ngan ngon la mos pa spangs pa'i phyir te/ bdag*[b] *la gdung bar*[c] *mi byed pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 72,11-12] ***ataptakāyavāksamudācāraḥ kaṣṭatapolūhādhimuktivivarjitatayā*** *'nātma*[d]*tapatvāt/*

His conduct of body and speech is untormented because he has avoided all violent asceticism and adherence to what is miserable. Because he does not torment himself.[441]

[AS 60,20-21] "Conduct of Body and Speech not to be Regretted": Explanation[442]

[AS$_{c}$ 681a17-18] 云何身語不惱現行。棄捨財業無悔惱故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106b3] *ji ltar na lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa phyis 'gyod pa med pa yin zhe na*[e]*/ longs spyod dang las kyi mtha' spangs pa la 'gyod pa med pa'i phyir ro*[f]*//*

katham ananutāpyakāyavāksamudācāro *bhavati/* ***samutsṛṣṭabhogakarmāntāvipratisāritaḥ/***

How is his conduct of body and speech not to be regretted? Because he does not regret having abandoned his possessions and occupations.[443]

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bdag*; Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rgyud*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bar*; Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba*.

[d] ASBh$_{T}$ *°vivarjitayā 'nātma°*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *°vivarjitayatvād/ anātma°*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[f] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *phyir ro*; Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *phyir ro*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *phyir*.

[ASBh 72,12-13] "Conduct of Body and Speech not to be Regretted": Further Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 65a4-5] *lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa phyis 'gyod pa med pa ni longs spyod pa rnams*[a] *dang las kyi mtha'* *rnams*[b] *spangs pa la*[c] *brtsams*[d][444] *nas 'gyod pa med pa'i phyir te*[e]*/ phyis*[f] *'gyod pa med pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 72,12-13] ***ananu***[g] ***tāpya***[h] ***kāyavāksamud-ācāraḥ*** *samutsṛṣṭān bhogān karmāntāṃś cārabhyāvipratisāritayā paścāttāpābhāvāt/*

His conduct of body and speech is not to be regretted because he does not regret having abandoned his possessions, occupations and so on. Because there will be no torment [by remorse] later.

[AS 60,21-22] "Conduct of Body and Speech Without Regret": Explanation[445]

[AS$_c$ 681a18-19] 云何身語無悔現行。雖得少分不以爲喜而無悔恨故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106b3-4] *ji ltar na lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa yid la gcags*[i] *pa med pa yin zhe na*[j]*/ cung zad tsam gyis chog par mi 'dzin pa'i*[k] *yid la gcags*[l] *pa med pa'i phyir ro//*

katham ***avipratisārakāyavāksamudācāro*** *bhavati/* ***alpamātreṇāsaṃtuṣṭasyāvipratisāritayā/***

How is his conduct of body and speech without regret? Because [he] is without repentance [as he is] not satisfied with just a little [wholesome activity].

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *spyod pa rnams*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *spyod*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *mtha' rnams*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *mtha'*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *las*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGC}$ *brtsams*; ASBh$_{t,D}$ *b+ms*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *brtsams*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *nas 'gyod pa med pa'i phyir te*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *nas*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *phyis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *phyis*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *phyir*.

[g] ASBh 72, n. 2: "Ms. *ta*".

[h] ASBh$_T$ *ananutāpya*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *atanutāpya*.

[i] AS$_{t,DC}$ *gcags*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bcags*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gcags*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bcags*.

[j] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[k] *pa'i*; AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'i*.

[l] AS$_{t,PGDC}$ *gcags*; AS$_{t,N}$ *bcags*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bcags*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gcags*.

[ASBh 72,13-15] "Conduct of Body and Speech Without Regret": Further Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 65a5-6] *lus dang ngag gi kun tu spyod pa yid la bcags*[a] *pa med pa ni dge ba'i phyogs la*[b] *brtsams nas*[c] *cung zad tsam gyis chog par mi 'dzin pa'i yid la bcags*[d] *pa med pa'i phyir te/ bsgrub*[e] *nus pa'i bar du'o*[f]*//*

[ASBh 72,13-15] ***avipratisāra kāyavāksamudācāraḥ*** *kuśalapakṣam ā*[ASBh$_{MS}$ 65b]-***rabhyālpamātreṇāsaṃtuṣṭasyā vipratisāritayā*** *yāvacchakyaṃ saṃpādanāt//*

His conduct of body and speech is without regret because he is not regretful, [being] not satisfied[446] with just a little as regards what belongs to [the realm of] the wholesome [mental factors].[447] Because he accomplishes [them] to the best of his ability.[448]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,P}$ *bcags*; ASBh$_{t,NGDC}$ *gcags*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *la*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *la* (letter erased?).

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *nas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *na*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGC}$ *bcags*; ASBh$_{t,D}$ *gcags*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bcags*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gcags*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *bsgrub*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *sgrub*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *sgrub*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *bar du'o*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *dbar du'o* (graph erased before *da*). Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bar du'i phyir ro*.

[AS 60,23-61,1] Sūtra Quotation: "Beings Have *Karman* as their Own, etc."[449]

[AS$_c$ 681a20-22] 如世尊說。如是有情皆由自業。業所乖諍。從業所生依業出離業能分別[a]一切有情高下勝劣。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106b4-6] *bcom ldan 'das kyis sems can 'di dag ni*[b] *las bdag gir bya ba las kyi bgo skal la*[c] *spyod pa*[d]*/ las kyi skye*[e] *gnas pa*[f]*/ las brten*[g] *par bya ba dag ste*[h]*/ las ni sems can*[i] *mthon po dang/ dma'*[j] *ba dang/ ngan pa dang/ gya nom par*[k] *rnam par 'byed pa'o zhes gang gsungs pa*

yad uktaṃ bhagavatā ***karmasvakāḥ ime sattvāḥ karmadāyādāḥ karmayonīyāḥ karmapratisaraṇāḥ****/ karma sattvān vibhajati* ***uccanīcatāyāṃ hīnapraṇītāyāṃ*** *ca/*[450]

The Sublime One said: "These beings have *karman* as their own, are heirs of their *karman*, have *karman* as their womb, resort to their *karman*. *Karman* divides beings into high and low, miserable and excellent."

---

[a] AS$_c$ 別; AS$_c$ (宋, 元, 明, 宮 eds.) 對. Cf. AS$_c$ (中華 ed.) 別.

[b] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *dag ni*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *dag*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dag ni*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *skal la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *skal la*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *skal*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *la*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *skye*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *skye*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *skyes*.

[f] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa dang*.

[g] *las brten*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *las bstan*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *la brten*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *las brtan*.

[h] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba dag ste*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba la*.

[i] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *can*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *can dag*.

[j] AS$_{t,PNGD}$ *dma'*, AS$_{t,C}$ *dga'*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dma'*.

[k] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *par*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[AS 61,1-2] "Having *Karman* as their Own": Explanation

[AS$_c$ 681a22] 云何有情皆由自業。由自造業而受異熟故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106b6] *de la*[a]*/ las bdag gir bya ba ji lta bu yin zhe na*[b]*/ rang gis byas pa'i las kyi*[c] *rnam par smin pa myong ba'i phyir ro//*

tatra kathaṃ ***karmasvakāḥ/ svayaṃkṛtakarma-vipākapratisaṃvedanatām upādāya/***[451]

How do they have *karman* as their own? Because they experience the ripening of the *karman* they have done themselves.

[ASBh 72,16-18] "Having *Karman* as their Own": Further Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 65a6-7] *'di dag gi las ni*[d] *bdag gir bya ba*[e] *yin pas 'di dag ni las bdag gir bya ba dag go// de dag gi las bdag gir bya ba ji lta bu yin zhe na*[f]*/ rang gis*[g] *byas pa'i las kyi rnam par smin pa myong ba'i phyir te/ gang gzhan dag*[h][452] *dang thun mong ma yin pa de ni bdag gi zhes bya'o*[i]*//*

[ASBh 72,16-18] [§77] *karma svakam eṣāṃ ta ime* ***karmasvakāḥ****/ kathaṃ punas teṣāṃ karma svakaṃ bhavati/* ***svayaṃkṛtakarmavipākaprati-saṃvedanatām upādāya****/ tad dhi nāma svakam ity ucyate yat parair asādhāraṇam iti/*

[Because] *karman* is their own, they are those who have *karman* as their own. How then is *karman* their own? Because they experience the ripening of the *karman* they have done themselves. That is indeed (*hi nāma*) what is called "one's own": that which is not common (*asādhāraṇa*) to others.[453]

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *de la*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *la*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bu yin zhe na*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *bu zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bu yin*.

[c] AS$_{t,DC}$ *pa'i las kyi*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pa'i*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gi las ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *ni las*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *ni*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *ba*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *bar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *ba*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *ba ma*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bu yin zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bu zhe na*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *gis*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *gi las*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gis*.

[h] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gzhan dag*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gzhan*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ (illegible).

[i] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bya'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *brjod do*.

[AS 61,2-3] "Heirs of their *Karman*": Explanation

[AS$_c$ 681a24-25] 云何業所乖諍。於受自業所得異熟時。善不善業互違諍故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106b6-7] *ji ltar na las kyi bgo skal la spyod*[a] *pa yin zhe na/ rang gis byas pa'i rnam par smin pa myong ba de la dge ba dang mi dge ba'i las so so'i bgo skal*[b] *la spyod pa'i phyir ro//*

kathaṃ karmadāyādāḥ/ tasyāṃ svayaṃkṛta-vipākapratisaṃvedanāyāṃ kuśalākuśalānāṃ karmaṇām anyonyadāyādatām upādāya/

How are they heirs of their *karman*? Because with regard to that experience of the ripening of what they themselves have done they are, [dividing] among themselves, heirs to wholesome or unwholesome *karman*.

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGD}$ *spyod*; AS$_{t,C}$ *smyod*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *spyod*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNGD}$ *skal*; AS$_{t,C}$ *sal*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *skal*.

[ASBh 72,18-20] "Heirs of their *Karman*": Further Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 65a7-b1] *'di dag ni las kyi bgo skal la spyod pa yin pas 'di dag ni las*[a] *kyi bgo skal la spyod pa dag go// ji ltar na las kyi bgo skal la spyod pa nyid yin zhe na/ rang gis byas pa'i*[b] *rnam par smin pa myong ba de la dge ba dang mi dge ba so so'i bgo skal la spyod pa'i phyir te/ 'di lta ste/ rang rang gi 'bras bu 'dod pa dang mi 'dod pa 'ged*[c][454] *pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 72,18-20] *karmāṇi dāyāya eṣāṃ ta ime* ***karmadāyādāḥ/ kathaṃ karma***[d] ***ṇāṃ dāyādatvam***[e] */ tasyāṃ* ***svayaṃkṛtavipākapratisaṃvedanāyāṃ kuśalākuśalānāṃ karmaṇām anyonyadāyādatām upādāya,*** *yathāsvam i*[f]*ṣṭāniṣṭaphalasaṃvibhajanāt/*

[Because] they have *karmas* for their heritage (*dāyāya*), they are those who heirs of their *karman* (*karmadāyādāḥ*). How are they heirs of their *karman*? Because in the experience of the ripening of what they themselves have done they are, [dividing] among themselves,[455] heirs to wholesome or unwholesome *karman*. Namely, because of the distribution of their own wanted or unwanted fruit (*phala*).

[AS 61,3-4] "Having *Karman* as their Womb": Explanation

[AS$_c$ 681a25-26] 云何從業所生。是諸有情遠離無因惡因。唯從業所生故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106b7-8] *ji ltar na las kyi skye gnas pa yin zhe na*[g]*/ rgyu med pa dang mi mthun pa'i rgyu rnam par spangs pa'i las kyi skye gnas las sems can byung*[h] *ba'i phyir ro//*

kathaṃ karmayonīyāḥ/ sattvānām ahetuviṣamahetuvarjita*karmayonisaṃbhavatām upādāya/*

How do they have *karman* as their womb?[456] Because beings arise from *karman*–which is [a principle] avoiding (*varjita*) [the wrong ideas of arising] without a cause or from an inadequate cause–as their womb.

---

a ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'di dag ni las*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *las*.

b ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *pa'i*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *pa'i las kyi*.

c ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *'ged*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *'god*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'byed*.

d ASBh 72, n. 3: "Ms. *rmā*."

e *dāyādatvam* ; ASBh$_T$ *dāyādatbam* (misprint).

f ASBh 72, n. 4: "T. *yathā svaṃ° sami°*."

g AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

h AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *byung*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *'byung*.

[ASBh 72,21-23] "Having *Karman* as their Womb": Further Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 65b1-3] *rang gis byas pa'i las la*[a] *'dod pa dang mi 'dod pa dag gi*[b] *rnam par smin pa myong ba'i sems can de dag thog ma ga*[c] *las byung/ ci rgyu med pa las byung ba zhig gam/ 'on te rang bzhin dang dbang phyug la sogs pa'i rgyu las byung ba zhig ce na/ smras pa/ las kyi skye gnas pa dag go*[d]*// 'di dag gi*[e] *las nyid*[f] *rgyu med pa dang mi mthun pa'i rgyu rnam*[g] *par spangs pa'i skye gnas te/ sems can rnams 'byung ba'i phyir zhes bya ba'i tha tshig go//*

[ASBh 72,21-23] *te punaḥ svakṛta-karmeṣṭāniṣṭavipākapratisaṃvedinaḥ sattvāḥ*[h] *kuta*[i] *āditaḥ*[j] *saṃbhūtāḥ kim* ***ahetukā***[k] *āhosvit prakṛtīśvarādihetukā ity āha* ***karmayonīyāḥ****/ karmaivaiṣām* ***ahetu viṣamahetu****varjitā*[l] *yoniḥ* ***sattvānāṃ*** *saṃbhavāyety arthaḥ/*

Again, those beings who experience the ripening, [be it] wanted or unwanted, of the *karman* they themselves have done, from where did they come about originally? [Did they come about] without a cause or rather from causes like Nature (*prakṛti*),[457] the Lord (*īśvara*), or the like? [With] such [a question in mind] it is spoken [in the sūtra]: "They have *karman* as their womb." The meaning is [as follows:] Only *karman* is the womb (*yoni*) for the arising of these beings, [the doctrine of *karman* as a womb] removes (lit. abandons, *varjita*) [the wrong ideas of arising] without a cause or from an inadequate cause.[458]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *las la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *las*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gis*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ga*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa dag go*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *las 'gyur ro*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gi*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gis*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *nyid*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *nyid*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *kyi*.

[g] ASBh$_{t,PNDC}$ *rnam*; ASBh$_{t,G}$ *rnams*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rnam*.

[h] ASBh$_{MS}$ *sattvāḥ*; ASBh$_{T}$ *sattbāḥ* (misprint).

[i] ASBh$_{T}$ *kuta*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *kutaḥ/*.

[j] ASBh$_{T}$ *āditaḥ*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *ādita*.

[k] ASBh$_{T}$ *ahetukā*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *ahetukāḥ/*.

[l] *varjitā*; ASBh$_{T,MS}$ *varjito*.

[ASBh 72,23-24] "*Karman* as Their Womb" and "They Resort to *Karman*": Connection

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 65b3-4] *de ltar 'jug pa las kyang brtsams ldog pa las kyang brtsams nas*[a] *las brten*[b] *par bya ba dag ste/*

[ASBh 72,23-24] *evaṃ tāvat pravṛttim ārabhya nivṛttim apy ārabhya* ***karmapratisaraṇāḥ/***

In that way, in the first place, with reference to their arising [it has been said that beings have *karman* as their womb]. [And] also with regard to their termination [it has been said that] they resort to *karman*.[459]

[AS 61,4-5] "They Resort to *Karman*": Explanation

[AS$_c$ 681a26-27] 云何依業。出離依對治業解業縛故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 106b8] *ji ltar na las*[c] *brten*[d] *par bya ba yin zhe na*[e]*/ las kyi*[f] *bcings pa las rnam par thar bar*[g] *byed pa'i gnyen po'i las brten*[h] *pa yin pa'i phyir ro//*

kathaṃ ***karmapratisaraṇāḥ/*** *karmabandhana-vimokṣaṇapratipakṣakarmapratisaraṇatvāt/*

How do they resort to *karman*? Because they resort to the *karman* that is the antagonist [in order to achieve] liberation from the fetter of *karman*.

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *nas*; Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *te*.

[b] *brten*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bstan*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *brtan*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGD}$ *las*; AS$_{t,C}$ *lus*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *las*.

[d] AS$_{t,DC}$ *brten*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bstan*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *brtan*.

[e] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *yin zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *yin*.

[f] AS$_{t,C}$ *kyi* ; AS$_{t,PNGD}$ *kyis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *kyi*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *kyis*.

[g] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *bar*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *ba*.

[h] AS$_{t,DC}$ *brten*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bsten*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *brten*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *brtan*.

[ASBh 72,24-25] "They Resort to *Karman*": Further Explanation

[$ASBh_{t,P}$ 65b3-4] *zag pa dang bcas pa'i las spang*[a] *ba'i phyir*[b] *zag pa med pa'i las rten yin pas/ 'di dag gi*[c] *brten*[d][460] *par bya ba ni*[e] *las nyid*[f] *yin no//*

[ASBh 72,24-25] *sāsravakarma-prahāṇāyānāsravakarmasaṃśrayaṇāt karmaivaiṣāṃ pratisaraṇaṃ bhavatīti//*

They resort to *karman* without inflow in order to abandon *karman* with inflow. Therefore only *karman* turns out to be (*bhavati*) their resort.[461]

[AS 61,5-6] "High and Low Beings": Explanation

[AS_c 681a27-28] 云何由業有情高下。謂猶[g]業故於善惡趣得自體差別。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 107a1] *sems can mthon po dang*[h] *dma' ba gang zhe na*[i]*/ bde 'gro dang ngan 'gror*[j] *lus thob pa'o//*

uccanīcāḥ *sattvāḥ katame/ sugatidurgatyor prati-labdhātmabhāvāḥ/*[463]

What are high and low beings? Those who have attained existence[462] in the good and bad destinies.

---

[a] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *spang*; Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *spangs*.

[b] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *phyir*; Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *phyir ro*.

[c] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *gi*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *ni*.

[d] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *brten*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,P}$ *brten*; $ASVy_{t,D}$ *brtan*.

[e] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba ni*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *ba'i*.

[f] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *las nyid*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *las*.

[g] AS_c 猶; AS_c (宋, 元, 明, 宮 eds.) 由.

[h] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *dang*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,D}$ *dang*; $ASVy_{t,P}$ *dag*.

[i] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[j] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *'gror*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *'gro'i*.

[AS 61,7] "Evil and Excellent Beings": Explanation

[AS_c 681a28-29] 云何勝劣。謂諸有情成就功德過失差別

[$AS_{t,P}$ 107a1] *ngan pa dang gya nom pa gang zhe na*[a]*/ de dag nyid skyon dang ldan pa dang yon tan dang ldan pa'o//*

hīnapraṇītāḥ *katame/ ta eva doṣasamanvāgatā guṇasamanvāgatāś ca/*

What are miserable and excellent [beings]? The same [beings] as far as they are furnished with faults and those who are furnished with qualities.

[AS 61,8-9] Scope of Sūtra Quotation: "Ripening of *Karman* Unthinkable"[464]

[AS_c 681b1-2] 如世尊說。有情業異熟不可思議。云何業異熟可思議。云何業異熟不可思議。

[$AS_{t,P}$ 107a1-2] *sems can rnams kyi las kyi rnam par smin pa bsam gyis mi khyab bo zhes gang gsungs pa de la las kyi rnam par smin pa bsam gyis khyab*[b][466] *pa ni ji lta bu/ bsam gyis mi khyab pa ni ji lta bu zhe na/*

yad uktam acintyaḥ sattvānāṃ karmavipāka iti/ *tatra* ***kathaṃ*** *karmavipākaś* ***cintyaḥ/*** *katham* ***acintyaḥ/***

It has been said [in the sūtras] "the ripening of *karman* for the beings is unthinkable".[465] How is the ripening of *karman* thinkable? How is it unthinkable?

---

[a] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *gang zhe na*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *gang*.

[b] $AS_{t,DC}$ *khyab*; $AS_{t,PNG}$ *mi khyab*.

[ASBh 72,26-27] "The Ripening of *Karman* is Unthinkable": Restriction

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 65b4-5] *sems can rnams kyi las kyi rnam par smin pa bsam gyis mi khyab bo*[a]*// zhes gang gsungs pa de ni*[b] *rnam pa thams cad du bsam gyis mi khyab pa ma yin*[c] *par rig*[d] *par bya'o// bsam gyis khyab pa ni ji lta bu/ bsam*[e][467] *gyis mi khyab pa ni ji lta bu zhe na*[f]*//*

It has been said "the ripening of *karman* for the beings is unthinkable". It has to be understood that [the ripening of *karman*] is not unthinkable in all aspects. How then is it thinkable? How is it unthinkable?

[ASBh 72,26-27] ***yad uktam acintyaḥ sattvānāṃ karmavipāka*** *iti, na sarvaiḥ prakārair*[g] *asāv*[h] *acintyo veditavyaḥ/* ***kathaṃ*** *tarhi* [ASBh$_{MS}$ 66a] ***cintyaḥ***[i] ***katham acintyaḥ/***

[AS 61,9-10] Ripening of Wholesome *Karman* in Higher Realms is Thinkable

[AS$_c$ 681b2-3] 謂諸善業於人天趣得可[j]愛異熟。是可思議。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 107a2-3] *las dge ba'i*[k] *rnam par smin pa lha dang mi rnams kyi nang du 'dod pa ni bsam gyis khyab*[l] *pa'o//*

That wholesome *karman* has a wanted ripening among gods and humans is thinkable.

kuśalasya karmaṇo[468] *iṣṭo vipāko*[469] *deva-manuṣyeṣu cintyaḥ/*

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *bo*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *pa'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bo*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa de ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *ma yin*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *yin*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ma yin*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,NGDC}$ *rig*; ASBh$_{t,P}$ *rag*; Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rig*.

[e] *bsam gyis khyab pa ni ji lta bu/ bsam*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bsam*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bsam gyis khyab pa ni ji lta bu/ bsam*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bu zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bu*.

[g] *prakārair*; ASBh$_{T,MS}$ *prakāraiḥ*.

[h] *asāv*; ASBh$_T$ *[a] sāv*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *sāv*.

[i] ASBh 72, n. 5 (for *kathaṃ tarhi cintyaḥ*): "T. drops *katham*° ... *cintyaḥ*."

[j] AS$_c$ 得可; AS$_c$ (明 ed.) 可得.

[k] AS$_{t,DC}$ *ba'i*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *ba rnams kyi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba'i*.

[l] AS$_{t,DC}$ *khyab*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *mi khyab*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *khyab*.

[AS 61,10-11] Ripening of Unwholesome *Karman* in Lower Realms is Thinkable

[AS$_{c}$ 681b3-4] 諸不善業墮三惡趣得不愛異熟。是可思議。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 107a3-4] *mi dge ba'i las kyi rnam par smin pa sems can dmyal ba dang dud 'gro dang/ yi dags kyi*[a] *ngan song ngan 'gro log par ltung ba rnams su mi 'dod pa zhes bya ba ni bsam gyis khyab*[b] *pa'o//*

akuśalasya karmaṇo 'niṣṭo vipāko narakatiryak-preteṣv āpāyadurgativinipāteṣv iti ***cintyaḥ****/*

That unwholesome *karman* has an unwanted ripening in the miserable states, bad destinies, downfalls, [i.e. those of] hell beings, animals and hungry spirits is thinkable.

[ASBh 73,1-2] Ripening in Higher and Lower Realms Thinkable: Explanation[470]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 65b5-6] *dge ba dang mi dge ba'i rnam par smin pa bde 'gro dang ngan 'gror 'dod pa dang mi 'dod pa zhes bya ba ni*[c] *bsam gyis khyab*[d] *ste/ nus pa dang*[471] *yang dag pa'i*[e] *lta ba la sogs pa'i yon tan khyad par can*[f][472] *'dren pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 73,1-2] *kuśalākuśalasyeṣṭāniṣṭo* ***vipākaḥ*** *sugatidurgatyor*[g] *iti* ***cintyaḥ****, śakyatvāt samyag-dṛṣṭyādiguṇāvāhanāc ca/*

[That] wholesome and unwholesome [*karman*] has a wanted and unwanted ripening [respectively] in good and bad destinies is thinkable. Because it is possible [to comprehend it] and because it entails virtues such as right view and so on.

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *kyi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dang*.

[b] AS$_{t,DC}$ *khyab*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *mi khyab*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *mi khyab*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *khyab*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba ni*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba*.

[d] *khyab*; ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *mi khyab*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *mi khyab pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *khyab pa*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *mi khyab pa*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *par*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *tan khyad par can*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *tan*.

[g] ASBh$_{T}$ °*durgatyor*; ASBh$_{MS}$ °*durgat++tyor*

[AS 61,11-12] Unthinkable: *Karman* Brings about Various Bodies of Sentient Beings[473]

[AS$_c$ 681b4-5] 即由此業感諸有情自身異熟等種種差別。不可思議。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 107a4] *las 'dis*[a] *sems can rnams kyi lus sna tshogs su 'gyur zhes bya ba 'di ni bsam gyis mi khyab pa'o*[b]*//*

anena karmaṇā sattvānām ātmabhāvavaicitryam ity *ayam* ***acintyaḥ//***

[To think that] "by this [specific] *karman* the variety of bodies of beings comes about", this is [how] the [ripening of *karman* is] unthinkable.

[ASBh 73,2-4] *Karman* Brings about Various Bodies of Sentient Beings: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 65b6-7] *las 'dis sems can rnams kyi lus kyi kha dog dang dbyibs la sogs pa rnam pa tha dad pa sna tshogs zhes bya ba ni bsam gyis mi khyab pa ste*[c]*/ mi nus pa dang/ thams cad mkhyen pa nyid*[d] *las gzhan pa mgo rmongs pa la sogs pa'i nyes pa 'dren pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 73,2-4] ***anena karmaṇā sattvānām ātmabhāva****sya varṇasaṃsthānādi prakārabheda-* ***vaicitryam ity acintyaḥ****/ aśakyatvāt sarvajñād anyasyonmādādidoṣāvāhanāc ca/*

[To ponder that] "through this *karman* the variety (*vaicitrya*) of the bodies of beings [in terms of] the various kinds of colour, shape, and so on[474] [comes about]" is [how the ripening of *karman* is] unthinkable. Because it is impossible [to comprehend it] and because it entails faults such as insanity for anyone else than the Omniscient One.

---

[a] *'dis*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *'dis ni*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *'di.*

[b] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pa'o*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *bo.*

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa ste.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'o.*

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa nyid.* Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa.*

[AS 61,12-13] Unthinkable Aspects of *Karman*: Location, Object, Cause and Ripening[475]

[AS$_c$ 681b6-7] 又即善不善業。處差別事差別因差別異熟差別品類差別等。皆不可思議。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 107a4-5] *las dge ba dang mi dge ba de nyid gnas dang/ dngos po dang/ rgyu dang rnam par smin pa dang/ rab tu dbye bas ni bsam gyis mi khyab ste*[a]/

***tad eva** kuśalākuśalaṃ **karma sthānavastuhetu-vipāka**prabhedair **acintyam**/*

That same wholesome and unwholesome *karman* is unthinkable from the point of view of its location, object, cause and ripening.

[ASBh 73,4] Location etc. of *Karman* are Unthinkable

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 65b7-8] *dge ba la sogs pa'i las de nyid gnas la sogs pa'i rab tu dbye bas ni bsam gyis mi khyab bo*[b]//

[ASBh 73,4] ***tad eva***[c] ***karma sthāna**ādibhir acintyam/*

That same *karman* is unthinkable from the point of view of its location, and so on.[476]

[ASBh 73,4-5] Location of *Karman* is Unthinkable: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 65b8] *de la gnas ni grong ngam*[d] *grong khyer gyi phyogs gang du gnas nas las de byas zhes bya ba la sogs pa'o*//

[ASBh 73,4-5] *[tatra **sthānam**] yatra pradeśe sthitvā yat karma kṛtvā*[e] *grāme vā nagare vetyādi/*

[Here, location means] the place in which one stood when doing the action,[477] be it a village, a town, and so on.[478]

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *ste*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *pa'o*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ste*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bo*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'o*.

[c] ASBh 73, n. 2: "T. adds *kuśalādi*."

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ngam*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *ngam*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *ngan*.

[e] ASBh 73, n. 1(for °*ādiprakārabhedavaicitryam ... kṛtvā*): "'*ādiprakāra... kṛtvā*' is in the bottom margin of Ms."

[ASBh 73,5-6] Object of *Karman* is Unthinkable: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 65b8-66a1] *dngos po ni sems can gyi grangs*[a] *su gtogs pa'am/ sems can ma yin pa'i grangs*[b] *su gtogs pa gang la brten te byas pa'o//*

[ASBh 73,5-6] ***vastu*** *yadadhiṣṭhānaṃ sattva*[T. 66A]*saṃkhyātam asattvasaṃkhyātaṃ vā/*

The object [means] what is the base [for the action], be it considered a sentient being or not considered a sentient being.[479]

[ASBh 73,6-7] Cause of *Karman* is Unthinkable: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66a1] *rgyu ni dge ba dang mi dge ba'i rtsa ba*[c] *rnams te/ ji ltar mthun mthun du sbyar ro*[d]*//*

[ASBh 73,6-7] ***hetuḥ*** *kuśalākuśalādeḥ*[e] [482] *kuśalākuśala mūlāni yathāyogam/*

The cause are the roots of wholesome or unwholesome[480] [actions in the case] of wholesome. unwholesome and other [actions]. [It is to be understood] as appropriate [to the action].[481]

[ASBh 73,7] Ripening of *Karman* is Unthinkable: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66a1-2] *rnam par smin pa ni lus sna tshogs*[f] *de nyid do//*

[ASBh 73,7] ***vipākas*** *tad evātmabhāvavaicitryam/*[g]

The ripening is exactly that variety of existences (i.e. bodies).[483]

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *grangs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *grangs*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *grongs*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *grangs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *grangs*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *grongs*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,GDC}$ *rtsa ba*; ASBh$_{t,PN}$ *rtsa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rtsa ba*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *ji ltar mthun mthun du sbyar ro*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *ji ltar mthun mthun du sbyaro ro*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ji ltar rigs pa rnams so*.

[e] ASBh 73, n. 3: "T. & Ch. omit *kuśalākuśalādeḥ*."

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *tshogs*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *tshogs pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *tshogs pa*.

[g] ASBh 73, n. 4: " Ch. adds *prakāraḥ nānābhedāpramāṇaprakāraḥ*."

[AS 61,13-14] Unthinkable: *Karman* Brings about Variety of External Phenomena

[AS$_c$ 681b7-8] 復種種外事差別。能感業用不可思議。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 107a5] *phyi'i dngos po sna tshogs mngon par 'grub par byed pa'i las bsam gyis mi khyab pa'o*[a]*//*

bāhyabhāvavaicitryābhinirvartakaṃ karmācintyam/

The *karman* that produces the various external phenomena is unthinkable.

[ASBh 73,7-9] *Karman* Brings about Variety of External Phenomena: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66a2-3] *sna tshogs*[484] *mngon par 'grub par byed pa'i las bsam gyis mi khyab pa ni*[b] *las ci 'dra bas*[c] *tsher ma la sogs pa'i rno ba la sogs pa*[d] *byas pa ste/ 'jig rten gyi bsam par ma gtogs*[e][485] *pa'i phyir ro//*

[ASBh 73,7-9] ***bāhyabhāvavaicitryābhinirvartakaṃ***[f] ***karmācintyam/*** *kīdṛśena khalu karmaṇā kaṇṭakādīnāṃ taikṣṇyādikaṃ*[g] *kṛtam iti lokacintānantarbhavāt/*

The *karman* that produces the various external phenomena is unthinkable. [The question] through whatever (*kīdṛśena*) kind of *karman* the sharpness of thorns and so on is produced is not included in [what can or should be thought about with] the mind of [ordinary] people.

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pa'o*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *bo*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'o*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,NGD}$ *ni*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *nyid*; ASBh$_{t,P}$ *na*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bas*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *bar*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *pa*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *pa'i rno ba la sogs pa*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *gyi bsam par ma gtogs*; ASBh$_{t,D}$ *gyis bsam par ma gtogs*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *gyis bsam par gtogs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gyi khams pas mi rtogs*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gyi khams pas ma rtogs*.

[f] ASBh$_T$ *nirvartakaṃ*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *nivartakaṃ*.

[g] *taikṣṇyādikaṃ*; ASBh$_{T,MS}$ *taikṣṇādikaṃ*.

[AS 61,14] Unthinkable: *Karman* of Jewels, Mantras, Medicine, Medical Treatment[486]

[AS$_c$ 681b8-9] 又末尼珠藥草呪術相應業用不可思議。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 107a6] *nor bu*[a] *dang/ sngags dang sman dang/ mkhyud dpyad*[b] *dang ldan pa'i las bsam gyis*[c] *mi khyab*[d]

maṇimantrauṣadhimuṣṭiyogapratisaṃyuktaṃ karmācintyam/

The *karman* (i.e. efficacy)[487] that is connected with jewels, *mantras*, medicine [488] and medical treatment (*muṣṭiyoga*) is unthinkable.

[ASBh 73,9-12] *Karman* of Jewels, Mantras, Herbs and Medical Treatment Is Unthinkable

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66a3-5] *nor bu dang sngags dang sman dang mkhyud dpyad*[e] *dang ldan pa'i las bsam gyis mi khyab ste/*

[ASBh 73,9] ***maṇimantrauṣadhimuṣṭiyogaprati-saṃyuktaṃ karmācintyam/***

[The *karman* that is] connected with jewels, *mantras*,[489] herbs and medical treatment is unthinkable.

[ASBh 73,9-10] *Karman* of Jewels Is Unthinkable: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66a4] *de la nor bu dang ldan pa ni chu*[f] *shel*[490] *la sogs pa las chu 'byung ba la sogs pa'o//*

[ASBh 73,9-10] *tatra* ***maṇi*** ***[prati]saṃyuktaṃ*** *candrakāntādīnām udakakṣaraṇādi/*

[The *karman* that is] connected with jewels [means that] water and so on trickle[491] from the moon stone and so on.[492]

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGD}$ *bu*; AS$_{t,C}$ *du*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bu*.

[b] AS$_{t,DC}$ *dpyad*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bcas*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dpyad*.

[c] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gyis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *gyis*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gyi*.

[d] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *khyab*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *khyab bo/*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'o*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *dpyad*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *spyad*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *chu*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *zla ba chu*.

[ASBh 73,10-11] *Karman* of Mantras Is Unthinkable: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66a4] *sngags dang ldan pa ni sngags de*[a] *dag gis btab na mi 'tshig pa la sogs pa'o//*

[ASBh 73,10-11] ***mantrapratisaṃyuktaṃ*** *tadabhimantritānām adāhādi /*

[The *karman* that is] connected with *mantra*s [means that] what has been consecrated (*abhimantrita*) [493] by that [mantra] does not burn, and so on.

[ASBh 73,11] *Karman* of Herbs Is Unthinkable: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66a4] *sman dang ldan pa ni des zin na mi snang bar 'gyur ba la sogs pa'o//*

[ASBh 73,11] ***auṣadhipratisaṃyuktaṃ*** *tayā gṛhītayāntardhānādi/*

[The *karman* that is] connected with herbs [means that] by that [kind of herb, when] it is seized, one becomes invisible, etc.[494]

[ASBh 73,11-12] *Karman* of Medical Treatment Is Unthinkable: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66a4-5] *mkhyud dpyad*[b] *dang ldan pa ni mkhyud dpyad*[c] *de dang des*[d] *rims nad dang bral bar 'gyur ba la sogs pa'o//*

[ASBh 73,11-12] ***muṣṭiyogapratisaṃyuktaṃ*** *tena tena muṣṭiyogena jvarāpagamādi/*

[*Karman* that is] connected with medical treatment[495] [means that] fever[496] goes away through this or that medical treatment, and so on.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *sngags de*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *de*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *dpyad*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *spyad*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dpyad*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *dpyad*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *spyad*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dpyad*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PND}$ *dang des*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *dang* (letter erased)*d des*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dang des*.

[AS 61,14-15] Unthinkable: *Karman* of the Might of a Yogin

[AS$_c$ 681b9-10] 又諸觀行者威德業用不可思議。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 107a6] *rnal 'byor pa thams cad kyi mthu'i*[a] *las bsam gyis mi khyab*[b]*/*

All *karman* of the might of the Yogis is unthinkable.

sarvaṃ yogināṃ prabhāvakarmācintyam/

[ASBh 73,12-13] *Karman* of the Might of a Yogin Is Unthinkable: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66a5-6] *rnal 'byor pa thams cad kyi*[497] *mthu'i las bsam gyis mi khyab pa ji lta bu zhe na*[c]*/ de dag gi sems kyi*[d] *mthus sa chen po g.yo bar byed pa'am*[e]*/ nam mkha' la 'phur ba la sogs pa'o//*

[ASBh 73,12-13] ***sarvaṃ ca***[f] ***yogināṃ prabhāva-karmācintyam/*** *katham/ te cittaprabhāvena mahāpṛthivīṃ kampayanty ākāśena votpatantīty evamādi/*

The *karman* of the might of the Yogis is unthinkable. How? They, through the might of their thought, shake[498] the great earth[499] or fly up through the sky and so on.[500]

---

[a] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *mthu'i*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *mthu'i*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *mthun pa'i*.

[b] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *khyab*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *khyab bo*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'o*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa ji lta bu zhe na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'o*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *kyi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *kyi*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *kyis*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *pa'am*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *dam*.

[f] ASBh 73, n. 5: "Ms. *na*."

[AS 61,15-16] Unthinkable: *Karman* of Control of the Bodhisattvas[501]

[AS_c 681b10-11] 又諸菩薩自在業用不可思議。所謂

[$AS_{t,P}$ 107a6-7] *byang chub sems dpa*[a] *rnams kyi dbang gi*[b] *las bsam gyis mi khyab*[c] *ste/ 'di lta ste/*

bodhisattvānāṃ vaśitākarmācintyam/ tadyathā

The *karman* of control of the Bodhisattvas is unthinkable. It is as follows:

[ASBh 73,14] The *Karman* of Control of the Bodhisattvas Is Unthinkable: Explanation[502]

[$ASBh_{t,P}$ 66a6] *byang chub sems dpa' rnams kyi dbang la sogs pas*[d][503] *las gang byed pa de bsam gyis mi khyab pa ni 'di lta ste/*

[ASBh 73,14] ***bodhisattvānāṃ vaśitā****bhir yat kriyate* ***karma*** *tad* ***acintyam/ tadyathā***

The *karman* that Bodhisattvas do by means of their [kinds of] control, that is unthinkable. It is as follows:

---

[a] $AS_{t,PNDC}$ *dpa'*; $AS_{t,G}$ *dpa' dpa'*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *dpa'*.

[b] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *gi*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *gis*.

[c] $AS_{t,PNGDC}$ *khyab*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *khyab pa*.

[d] $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *pas*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,PD}$ *pa ni*.

[AS 61,16-17] Ten Kinds of Control: List[504]

[AS$_c$ 681b11-13] 命自在故。心自在故。財自在故。業[a]自在故。生自在故。勝解自在故。願自在故。神通自在故。智自在故。法自在故。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 107a7-8] *tshe la dbang ba dang/ sems la dbang ba dang/ yo byad la dbang ba dang/ las la dbang ba dang/ skye*[b] *ba la dbang ba dang/ mos pa la dbang ba dang/ smon lam la dbang ba dang/ rdzu 'phrul la dbang ba dang/ ye shes la dbang ba dang/*[c] *chos la dbang ba'i phyir ro//*

āyurvaśitayā cittavaśitayā pariṣkāravaśitayā karmavaśitayopapattivaśitayādhimuktivaśitayā praṇidhānavaśitayarddhivaśitayā jñānavaśitayā dharmavaśitayā/

Because of control over [their] lifetime, control over [their] thought, control over utensils, control over *karman*, control over birth, control over aspiration (*adhimukti*), control over resolution (*praṇidhāna*), control over magical powers (*ṛddhi*), control over knowledge (*jñāna*), control over the Dharma.

[AS 61,18-19] [AS$_c$ (From ASBh 73,14): Control of the Bodhisattvas Is Unthinkable: Explanation]

[AS$_c$ 681b13-14] 諸大菩薩由如是等自在力故所作業用不可思議。

[Addition by XUANZANG, see ASBh 73,14, above][505]

[ASBh 73,14-15] Control over Lifetime: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66a6-7] *tshe la dbang bas ni byang chub sems dpa' rnams*[d] *tshe'i 'du byed byin gyis brlabs nas ji srid 'dod pa de srid du gnas so//*

[ASBh 73,14-15] ***āyurvaśitayā*** *bodhisattvā āyuḥsaṃskārān adhiṣṭhā*[ASBh$_{MS}$ 66b]*ya yāvad icchanti tiṣṭhanti/*

Through control over [their] lifetime, the Bodhisattvas, having stabilized [their own] impulses [determining the] life-time (*āyuḥsaṃskāra*),[506] remain [alive] as long as they wish.

[a] AS$_c$ 業; AS$_c$ (元 ed.) 願.

[b] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *las la dbang ba dang/ skye*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *las la dbang ba dang/ skye*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *skye*.

[c] AS$_{t,DC}$ *ba dang/*; AS$_{t,PNG}$ *ba*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba dang*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rnams*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *rnams*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *rnams ni*.

[ASBh 73,16] Control over Thought: Explanation[507]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66a7] *sems la dbang bas ni ji ltar*[a] *'dod pa bzhin du ting nge 'dzin la snyoms par 'jug go//*

[ASBh 73,16] [§78(ii)] ***cittavaśitayā*** *yatheccham samādhīn samāpadyante/*

Through control over [their] thought, they get absorbed in concentration (*samādhi*)[508] as they wish.[509]

[ASBh 73,16-17] Control over Utensils: Explanation[510]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66a7-8] *yo byad la dbang bas ni sems can thams cad*[b][511] *la yo byad*[512] *rin che ba dang*[c][513] *dpag tu med pa'i char 'bebs*[514] *so//*

[ASBh 73,16-17] [§78(iii)] ***pariṣkāra-vaśitayā*** *prameyam anargheyam upakaraṇa-varṣaṃ sattvānāṃ varṣanti/*

Through control over utensils (*pariṣkāra*) they shower down an immeasurable and precious rain of equipment (*upakaraṇa*) for the beings.

[ASBh 73,17-18] Control over *Karman*: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66a8] *las la dbang bas ni khams dang sa dang 'gro ba dang skye gnas dang gnas skabs gzhan na*[d] *myong*[e] *bar 'gyur ba'i las*[f] *rnams gzhan du bsgyur ro//*

[ASBh 73,17-18] [§78(iv)] ***karmavaśitayā***[g] *nyadhāt bhūmigatiyonyavasthā*[h] *ve danīyāni karmāṇy anyathā pariṇāmayanti/*

Through control over *karman*[515] they transform the *karmas* that were to be experienced in another realm (*dhātu*), on another plane (*bhūmi*),[516] in another destiny (*gati*), another species (*yoni*) or at another occasion[517] to being different.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ji ltar*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *ji ltar*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *ji srid*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *thams cad*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rnams*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rin che ba dang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rin po che*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gzhan na*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gzhan*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGC}$ *myong*; ASBh$_{t,D}$ *myang*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *myong*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *ba'i las*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *ba*.

[g] ASBh 73, n. 7 (for *'prameyam ... karmavaśitayā*) : "*aprameya*° ... *karmavaśitayā* is in the bottom margin of Ms."

[h] ASBh$_{T}$ °*sthā*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *syāṃ* added in upper margin.

[ASBh 73,18-19] Control over Birth: Explanation[518].

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66a8-b1] *skye ba la dbang bas ni bsam gtan la gnas shing yongs su ma nyams bzhin du 'dod pa'i khams su skye'o//*

[ASBh 73,18-19] [§78(v)] ***upapattivaśitayā*** *dhyā*[T. 66B]*nair api vihṛtyāparihīṇā eva* [a] *kāmadhātāv upapadyante/*[b]

Through control over birth, they are born in the realm of desire even after having dwelt in the absorptions [and] without having lost them.

[ASBh 73,20] Control over Aspiration: Explanation[519]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66b1] *mos pa la dbang bas ni sa la sogs pa*[c] *chu la sogs par mos so//*

[ASBh 73,20] [§78(vi)] ***adhimuktivaśitayā*** *pṛthivyādīny ab*[d]*āditvenādhimucyante/*

Through control over aspiration,[520] they transform earth and so on into water and so on.

[ASBh 73,20-21] Control over Resolution: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66b1-2] *smon*[e] *lam la dbang bas ni ji ltar 'dod pa bzhin du bdag dang gzhan gyi don phun sum tshogs par byed pa'i smon lam rgya chen po grangs med pa mngon par sgrub bo*[f]*//*

[ASBh 73,20-21] [§78(vii)] ***praṇidhānavaśitayā*** *yatheṣṭaṃ sva*[g]*parārthasampattikarāṇy asaṃkhyeyāni mahāpraṇidhānāny abhinirha[ra]nti/*

Through control over resolution,[521] they effect countless great resolutions that accomplish the benefit of [the Bodhisattvas] themselves and others as they wish.[522]

---

[a] ASBh 73, n. 8: "T. *evaṃ* (?)"

[b] ASBh 73, n. 6 (for *pariṣkāravaśitayā ... upapadyante*): "Ch. drops '*pariṣkāra° °papadyante*'."

[c] *pa*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *pa*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *pa la*.

[d] ASBh$_{MS}$ *pṛthivyādīny ab°*; ASBh$_{T}$ *pṛthivyādānab°*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGD}$ *smon*; ASBh$_{t,C}$ *smin*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *smon*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *sgrub bo*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *sgrub bo*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *bsgrubs so*.

[g] ASBh$_{MS}$ *sva°*; ASBh$_{T}$ *sba°*.

[ASBh 73,22] Control over Magical Powers: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66b2-3] *rdzu 'phrul la dbang bas ni sems can rnams 'dun par*[a] *bya ba'i phyir rdzu 'phrul gyi cho 'phrul dpag tu med pa kun tu ston*[523] *to//*

[ASBh 73,22] [§78(viii)] ***ṛddhivaśitayā*** *sattvānām āvarja*[b]*nārtham*[c] *aprameyam ṛddhiprāti-hāryaṃ*[d525] *saṃdarśa[yan]ti*[e]*/*

Through control over magical powers they display an unlimited spectacle of magical powers in order to attract beings.[524]

[ASBh 73,23] Control over Knowledge: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66b3] *ye shes la dbang bas ni chos dang don dang nges pa'i tshig dang spobs pa rnams kyi*[f] *rab kyi mthar phyin par 'gro'o//*[526]

[ASBh 73,23] [§78(ix)] ***jñānavaśitayā*** *dharmārthaniruktipratibhānānāṃ prakarṣa-paryantaṃ gacchanti/*

Through control over knowledge they reach (*gacchanti*) the limit of excellence [knowledge of] the *dharmas*, their meaning, interpretative etymology and eloquence.[527]

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *'dun par*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *'dul bar*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *gdul bar*.

[b] ASBh 73, n. 9: "Ms. *rjava* for *varja*."

[c] °*varjanārtham*; ASBh$_T$ °*vajanārtham*.

[d] *prātihāryaṃ*; ASBh$_{MS}$ *prātihāryaṃ* (unclear); ASBh$_T$ *pratihāryaṃ*.

[e] ASBh 73, n. 10: "Ms. *ti*."

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNG}$ *kyi*; ASBh$_{t,DC}$ *kyis*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *kyi*.

[ASBh 73,24-25] Control over the Dharma: Explanation[528]

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66b3-4] *chos la dbang bas ni ci rigs par ji tsam du sems can thams cad*[a] *la*[529] *ming dang tshig dang yi ge'i tshogs gzhan dang gzhan dag*[b] *gis mdo la sogs pa'i chos rnam par bzhag*[c] *nas cig car du*[d] *sems*[e] *yongs su tshim par byed nus par 'gyur ro//*

[ASBh 73,24-25] [§78(x)] ***dharmavaśitayā*** *yathārham yāvat sarvasattvānām anyonyair*[f] *nāmapadavyaṃjanakāyaiḥ sūtrādīn dharmān vyavasthāpya yugapac cittaparitoṣaṇe samarthā bhavantīti//*[g]

Through control over the Dharma, they are (*bhavanti*) able to satisfy the mind of all beings at the same time however it is appropriate (*yathārham*) and however many [beings there are], having established[530] the Teachings of the sūtras and so on[531] by means of this or that (*anyonyair*)[532] of the [three] groups [which are] word (*nāma*), sentences (*pada*) and syllables (*vyaṃjana*).[533]

[AS 61,19] Unthinkable: The Buddhas Carry out the Tasks of a Buddha

[AS$_c$ 681b14-15] 又一切佛所作諸佛應所作事業用不可思議。

[AS$_{t,P}$ 107a8] *sangs rgyas thams cad kyi*[h] *sangs rgyas kyi mdzad pa sgrub*[i] *pa'i*[j] *phrin las*[k] *bsam gyis mi khyab bo//*

sarvabuddhānāṃ buddhakṛtyānuṣṭhāna-karmācintyam/

The *karman* of all the Buddhas to carry out the tasks of a Buddha is unthinkable.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *thams cad*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rnams*.

[b] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gzhan dang gzhan dag*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *gzhan dag*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PGDC}$ *bzhag*; ASBh$_{t,N}$ *gzhag*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bzhag*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNDC}$ *car du*; ASBh$_{t,G}$ *char du*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *car*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *sems*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,P}$ *sems*; ASVy$_{t,D}$ *sems can*.

[f] ASBh$_{MS}$ *anyonyair*; ASBh$_{T}$ *anyānyair*.

[g] ASBh 73, n. 11: "T. & Ch. ad *sarva*."

[h] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *kyi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,D}$ *kyi*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *kyis*.

[i] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *sgrub*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *bsgrub*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *sgrub*.

[j] AS$_{t,PNG}$ *pa'i*; AS$_{t,DC}$ *pa'i phyir*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *pa'i*.

[k] AS$_{t,PNGDC}$ *las*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *las kyi las*.

[ASBh 74,1-3] Unthinkable: The Buddhas Carry out the Tasks of a Buddha: Explanation

[ASBh$_{t,P}$ 66a4-6] *sangs rgyas thams cad kyi sangs rgyas kyi mdzad pa sgrub*[a] *pa'i 'phrin las bsam gyis mi khyab pa ji lta bu zhe na/ sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das thams cad lhun gyis grub par rtogs*[b] *par thugs su*[c] *chud cing chos kyi dbyings ro gcig pa nyid du gyur nas sems can rnams la*[d] *gang gi tshe dang ji lta bu dang/ ji srid du mdzad pa bsgrub*[e] *par bya ba de thams cad rjes su gnas te/ de ltar sangs rgyas rnams kyi*[f] *yul bsam gyis mi khyab bo//*

[ASBh 74,1-3] ***buddhānāṃ buddhakṛtyānuṣṭhānakarmācintyam/*** *katham/ anābhogagatiṃgatā*[g] *dharmadhātve karasatāprāptā sarve buddhā bhagavantaḥ sattvānāṃ yathā yadā yāvat*[h] *kṛtyam anuṣṭhātavyaṃ tat sarvam anutiṣṭhanti/ evaṃ*[i] *buddhānāṃ buddhaviṣayo 'cintyaḥ//*

The *karman* of all the Buddhas to carry out the tasks of a Buddha[534] is unthinkable. How? All the eminent Buddhas who reached [the state of][535] effortlessness,[536] who have attained the state of one flavour [537] with the *dharmadhātu* [538] carry out any (*tat sarvaṃ*) task that is to be carried out for the beings, in whatever way, whenever and however many [beings there are]. In that way, the Buddha-range (*buddhaviṣaya*) [539] of the Buddhas is unthinkable.

---

[a] ASBh$_{t,D}$ *sgrub*; ASBh$_{t,PNGC}$ *bsgrub*.

[b] *rtogs*; ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *gtogs*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rtogs*.

[c] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *thugs su*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ *khong du*.

[d] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *rnams la*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *rnams*.

[e] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bsgrub*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *sgrub*.

[f] ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ *kyi*. Cf. ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *sangs rgyas kyi*.

[g] ASBh$_{MS}$ °*gatiṃgatā* (=Sakuma, *Index*, p. 25); ASBh$_{T}$ °*pratigatā*.

[h] *yāvat*; ASBh$_{T}$ *yābat* (misprint).

[i] ASBh 74, n. 1: "For our °*nti/ evaṃ*, Ms. °*ntyety evaṃ*."

NOTES TO THE EDITION AND TRANSLATION

---

[1] Canonical sources and parallels: I.a) *Madhyamāgama*, sūtra no. 111: "What is it to know action? It means that there are two kinds of action: that of thought, and the action after thought. That is the meaning of 'to know action'." (云何知業。謂有二業。思已思業。是謂知業, T 26, MĀ 600a23-24). I translate 思 as "thought" here (MATHEWS, *Chinese-English*, no. 5580: "to think, to contemplate, to consider."). I.b) *Ben-shi-jing* (本事經), the Chinese translation of the *Itivṛttaka*: "How should one understand the nature of actions? As for the nature of action: it means that there is an action of thought, as well as an action that follows thought. In this way one should understand the nature of actions ." (云何應知諸業自性。業自性者謂或思業或思已業。如是應知諸業自性。T 765 663b5-7). WATANABE ("Itivuttakas", p. 46) provides a chart of Pāli suttas in the Itivuttaka and their correlation to the Chinese version. According to his counting, this passage would belong to Kaṇḍa I,6 which has no equivalent in the Pāli. I.c) AN III, p. 415: "I say, monks, that intention (*cetanā*) is action. [Because only] after having intended (*cetayitvā*) one does action with [one's] body, with [one's] speech, with [one's] mind." (*cetanāhaṃ bhikkhave kammaṃ vadāmi / cetayitvā kammaṃ karoti kāyena vācāya manasā*). See also PĀSĀDIKA, *Kanonische Zitate*, p. 73, LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, ed., *Prasannapadā*, p. 306,3. II.a) AK IV.1b: *cetanā tatkṛtaṃ ca tat*; (AKBh$_{t,P}$ 190a7: *las ni sems pa dang des byas*) AKBh 192,10: *sūtra uktaṃ dve karmaṇī* <u>*cetanākarma*</u> *cetayitvā ceti / yat tac cetayitvā cetanākṛtaṃ ca tat / te ete dve karmaṇī trīṇi bhavanti / kāyavāṅmanaskarmāṇi /*; AKBh$_{t,P}$ *gu* 190a7f. (=AKBh$_{t,D}$ *ku* 166a4f.): *mdo las las* (P: *la las*; D: *las*) *ni gnyis te / sems pa dang bsams* (D: *bsams*; P: *bsam*) *pa'i las so zhes gang gsungs pa la / bsams* (D: *bsams*; P: *bsam*) *pa gang yin pa de ni / sems pas byas pa de yin no // las gnyis po de dag ni gsum yin te / lus dang ngag dang yid kyi las rnams so //*. • RED MDA' BA presents an altogether different definition (*mtshan nyid*) of *karman*: "As for the [part of the truth of] origination [consisting in] *karman*: The definition is 'that *karman* which brings about (lit. 'brings to actualization') reincarnation'." (*las kyi kun 'byung la / mtshan nyid ni / yang srid 'grub byed kyi las /*, AS-Red-mda', fol. 20a1f). For RED MDA' BA, the twofold classification of *karman* is made more specifically from the point of view of its nature (*ngo bo*): it is *karman* that is intention and the *karman* after having intended (*dbye na ngo bo'i sgo nas sems pa'i las dang / bsam pa'i las gnyis* [...], AS-Red-mda', fol. 20a2). On the Tibetan word *bsam pa*, see below.

[2] With 煩惱增上所生 (**kleśādhipateyaṃ karma*) AS$_c$ and ASVy$_c$ here repeat a phrase that is found at the beginning of the *samudaya* section: AS 43,10 (Sanskrit preserved) *samudayasatyaṃ katamat / kleśaḥ kleśādhipateyañ ca karma //*, AS$_{t,P}$: *kun 'byung gi* (D: *ba'i*) *bden pa gang zhe na / nyon mongs pa dang / nyon mongs pa'i dbang gis 'byung ba'i las so //* AS$_c$ 676a19: 云何集諦。謂諸煩惱及煩惱增上所生諸業. It seems as if XUANZANG wanted to provide a link to the previous section of the AS, dealing with the defilements (*kleśa*). A connection (*'brel ba*) between the various sections of a book is, at least according to Tibetan Buddhist scholasticism, a necessity for a scholastic treatise. See the entry *bstan bcos kyi chos bzhi* in KRANG-DBYI-SUN, ed., *Tshig mdzod chen mo*. Systematically, saying that the defilements influence *karman* is absolutely correct. In the

ASBh explanation of origination in dependence, for example, ignorance is a "influencing condition" (*adhipatipratyaya*) for the *saṃskāras* (i.e. *cetanā, karman*). See KRITZER, *Rebirth and Causation*, p. 32. On defilements as a cause for *karman*, see for example ERB, *Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti*, p. 122f., n. 198.

[3] Skt. *katama* normally means "who or which [of many]". Here it is used more broadly in the sense of *ka*, "which, what". See BÖHTLINGK and ROTH, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch* (s.v. *katama*), WACKERNAGEL and DEBRUNNER, *Altindische Grammatik*, vol. 2,2, p. 604 and SAKUMA, *Āśrayaparivṛtti*, vol. 2, p. 92, n. 561. • The Chinese equivalent for *katamat* here is 云何 (dto. the respective phrase at $ASVy_c$ 727a29). At times, the equivalents of AS_c and $ASVy_c$ differ: For example ad AS 53,6, where AS_c reads 何等 whereas the respective phrase at $ASVy_c$ 727b8 has 云何.

[4] Another possible translation for the term *cetanā* is "volition" (e.g. RAHULA, *Compendium*, p. 82, in French). The explanation given in the context of the ten paths of action (see below, ASBh 64,5-10) would even justify the rendering "decision", a rendering that is also advocated by VETTER (*"Khandha Passages"*, p. 29f.). ▪ In contrast to that, DREYFUS ("Ethical Activity", p. 35f.) states that *cetanā* implies more than conscious decision ("*Cetanā* does not imply rational deliberation. *Cetanā* is present in non-reflective spontaneous mental states", *op.cit.*, p. 36). As far as I see, *cetanā* does not necessarily require a high degree of reflexion or even a mental verbalization, and in so far I agree with DREYFUS. In the classical sutta (AN III, p. 415), *cetanā* is required for all action (*karman*), but I assume that not all action requires a conscious decision, especially once the doctrine of *cetanā* as a omnipresent (*sarvatraga*) mental factor was established, wherefore I prefer the equivalent "intention". But a *cetanā* quite surely *can* be accompanied by such conscious reflexion. The equivalent "decision" proposed by VETTER more strongly raises the association of a reflected, deliberate thought act. As far as reflexion is concerned I think the difference between the two English terms is not very strong and my preference for "intention" is based on the metaphorical implications of the original latin words ("cut off [one opportunity in favour of the other]" vs. "inner tension"). VETTER argues for "decision" on the grounds that "*cetanā* implies one acts accordingly [...] though deeds may be frustrated by external causes" (id., *"Khandha Passages"*, p. 30). Nonetheless, taking into account that one can still change one's mind after having made a decision (and such a demotivation is often a mixture between external and then internal causes), the semantic ranges of "intention" and "decision" mostly overlap regarding those criteria, as, to use a play of words, an intention is not necessarily less intense than a decision. On *cetanā*, see also MUROJI, *Pratītyasamutpādavyākhyā*, pp. 202-211. • The two kinds of action (i.e. intention and what follows intention) are explained in further detail below, AS 53,6-14. • LAMOTTE ("Traité de l'acte", p. 152) translates *cetayitvā kammaṃ karoti* of AN III, p. 415 as "après avoir voulu, on accomplit l'acte", and *cetayitvā karman* as "l'acte-après-avoir-volu". In both cases, PRUDEN's translation (LAMOTTE, *Treatise on Action*, p. 15) is not very precise: "after having willed it, one accomplishes action" in the first case, and "action-after-having-been-willed" in the second. • AS-'Jam-dbyangs (fols. 278b6-279a1) quotes a sūtra passage that is equivalent to AN III, p. 415 (*cetanāham* ...), but be does not

specify the source of his quotation: *mdo las / dge slong dag sems pa las su nga smra'ste / bsam pa yang ngo zhes gsungs pa ltar* [...]. • I do not reconstruct *bsams pa'i las* as **cetayitvākarma*, even though compounds with an absolutive as the first member exist, such as *upadāya-rūpa*, *pratītya-samutpāda*. My decision against a compound is due the fact that *cetayitvā* stands alone in the AKBh parallel, which suggests that *cetayitvā* and *karma* were originally meant as two separate words by the author of the AS. In the light of the above-quoted parallel in the AKBh (*dve karmaṇī cetanākarma cetayitvā c[a]*; Tib. *las ni gnyis te / sems pa dang bsam[s] pa'i* ***las*** *so*), there is also a possibility that the latter word *las* (*sems pa'i las dang / bsam[s] pa'i* ***las***) in the AS$_{t}$ was added arbitrarily by the translators into Tibetan, which would make a reconstruction *cetayitvā ca* ***karma*** unnecessary. • For *cetayitvā*, AS$_{t,P}$ has the future-tense morphology *bsam pa'i las* throughout. The noun *bsam pa* (thought) does not make any sense in this context, as *bsam pa'i las* [sic] refers to physical and vocal actions. As a gerundive, *bsam pa* (to be intended, to be thought) is equally inappropriate from the systematic point of view, for *bsam pa'i las* [sic] is clearly explained as following *sems pa'i las*. Philologically, the Sanskrit absolutive *cetayitvā* is only rendered appropriately by *bsams pa*, the perfect form of the Tibetan verb "to think, to intend" (*sems pa*). AS$_{t,DC}$ adheres to that correct form, in contrast to AS$_{t,PNG}$ *bsam* and ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ *bsam*. Note that in the explanation of *cetavitvā karma* below (ad AS 53,6-7), AS$_{t,NGDC}$ read *bsams*, against AS$_{t,P}$ and ASVy$_{t,PD}$ *bsam*. HIRAKAWA (AKBh-Index-Skt) has opted to leave the equivalent *bsam pa* uncorrected in the Sanskrit-Tibetan index to the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. In the Tibetan-Sanskrit (AKBh-Index-Tib) volume, he lists only *bsams pa*, with reference to the occurrence in AKBh$_{t,P}$ 190a7 (which actually reads *bsam pa*, against AKBh$_{t,D}$ 166a5: *bsams pa*!). Among contemporary Tibetan scholars, *bsam pa'i las* is more common than *bsams pa'i las*. See for example the respective entry in KRANG-DBYI-SUN, ed., *Tshig mdzod chen mo*, p. 3042: *bsam pa'i las / sems pa des bskyed pa'am kun nas bslangs pa'i lus ngag gi las so /*. See also BLO GTER DBANG PO's commentary on AK IV.1 (*mNgon pa mdzod rtsa 'grel*, p. 302): *sems pa <u>des byas</u> pa ste kun nas slong ba bsam pa'i las* [...]. Note that in the last two sources, the tenses of the explicatory verbs vary (*kun nas blangs pa, kun nas slong ba*...). See furthermore AS-Mi-pham, p. 456,3: *bsam pa'i las* and AS-Thar-lo, p. 354,1-2: *bsam las ni lus ngag lhan cig pa'i sems pa'o // de yang lus ngag yid gsum gyi'o //*. The orthography of AS-Bo-dong-Verse, p. 76,5 is grossly misleading: *las ni sems dang sems pa'i las*. But below, it reads: *sems pa 'du byed yid kyi las* and *bsam pa lus ngag yid kyi las* (*ibid.*, 76,5-6), the latter being AK doctrine, as far as I understand (see my discussion below). • RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 83, n. 1) refers to the occurrences of the term *sañcetanikaṃ kammam* in MN III, p. 209, and AN V, pp. 292, 294, 297, 299. It nonetheless seems that *sañcetanikaṃ kammam* is not identical *cetayitvā karman*, especially if the latter is differentiated from *cetanā* in the sense of mental *karman*.

[5] The phrase "*cetanāhaṃ bhikkhave kammaṃ vadāmi / cetayitvā kammaṃ karoti kāyena vācāya manasā /*" appears as the fundamental definition of *kamma* at AN III, p. 415 (part of AN III, no. 63, *Nibbedhikasutta*; for a translation, see THANISSARO BHIKKHU, *Wings to Awakening*, p. 51). The respective sutta passage analyses *kamma* under six aspects: (1.) *kamma* (as such), (2.) the arising of the causes (*nidānasambhava*) of *kamma*. That is followed by *kamma*s (3.) diversity, (4.) ripening (5.) cessation, and (6.) the path leading

to its cessation. In this context, (1.) *kamma* (as such) is explained through the phrase *cetanāhaṃ* and so on without any further comment. I wonder whether the *Nibbedhikasutta* is the earliest text that uses the phrase "*cetanāhaṃ* ...". From the overall impression, it seems quite possible that an already well-known and popular slogan has been used for this rather detailed and analytical passage on *karman* in the *Nibbedhikasutta.* Scholars now generally agree that the canonical sutta material contains interpolations even though the exact historical strata are difficult to determine. See, e.g. SCHMITHAUSEN, "Liberating Insight", p. 201, and MAITHRIMURTHI, *Vier* apramāṇas, p. 74f. CONZE (*Buddhist Thought in India*, p. 32) suspected especially the numerical lists in the suttas to be later elaborations. The six aspects *kamma* in the *Nibbedhikasutta* might well be one of them. (CONZE, *ibid.*, was also of the opinion that all canonical sutta material precedes the Abhidharma treatises. Nonetheless, the two genres may well have undergone development simultaneously for a certain period.)

[6] The expression *api khalu* (Tib. *yang*) is often used in the AS to adduce another explanation on the subject treated (see, e.g. AS 84,13, AS 89,8, both preserved in the MS). The explanations so arranged often stem from different sources. See SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 192.

[7] This second categorization does not fit into the scheme of the above *cetanā* and *cetayitvā*. The *kāritrakarma* of inanimate objects, for example, does neither constitute nor presuppose any intention. While the first scheme (two kinds of action) rather seeks to explain action in the sense of the metaphysical *karman* theory, the second scheme (five kinds) rather explains the range of the word *karman*, also in non-metaphysical contexts. • The source of the fivefold scheme is unknown, while is also found in the AS section on debate (*Sāṃkathyaviniścaya*). The respective passage of the Sāṃkathyaviniścaya (AS 103,4f.) primarily deals with interrelations and causation, and not with *karman* in the religious sense, wherefore it contains the fivefold scheme exclusively, and not the twofold one. I could not locate any occurrence of this list outside the AS. Also the *Foguang dacidian*, p. 1166, lists those five kinds, referring only to $ASVy_c$ and JI's AS commentary (雑集論述記) as its sources. • In Sanskrit grammar, *karman* is a technical term denoting the object of an action. See BÖHTLINGK (*Pāṇini's Grammatik*, pp. 36f., 56). In the description of natural language, nontheless, the distinction between *karman* as act and *karman* as object is not always an easy one. See, e.g., SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 386, n. 631a. See also SCHMITHAUSEN's entry on *karman* in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, vol. 4.

[8] CONZE, *Buddhist Thought in India*, p. 216 translates *upalabdhi* as "apprehension".

[9] The implied elements ("and so on") are the other four sense faculties (auditory, olfactory, gustatory, tactile) and the other four objects of the senses. For a chart, see AKBh-Index-Skt, p. XV. • Strictly speaking, "eye" (*cakṣur*) should not refer to the biological organ (the "lump of meat", *māṃsapiṇḍa*) here, but to the visual sense faculty (*cakṣurindriya*) which is prerequisite for the arising of visual perception (*vijñāna*). On the distinction between the biological sense organ and the sense faculty consisting of "pellucid matter" (*rūpaprasāda*), see my notes ad ASBh 68,27-28, below. Note that the AS here presents a theory of perception that is completely in accordance with the most

fundamental teachings on the 18 *dhātus* (where there are only six *vijñānas*), without any reference to the *ālayavijñāna*. "Seeing" is in this AS passage a mere act of perception without any explicitly stated dependence of the object on the subject, a mutual dependence of the two, or a common dependence on the *ālayavijñāna*. ▪ The definition at AS 3,3-6, in contrast, stresses the *ālayavijñāna* as the root of the whole process of perception, and the dependence of visual objects on the eye faculty: Firstly, the AS defines the eye faculty (here named **cakṣurdhātu*) as that which sees and looks at visual objects, but also as the *ālayavijñāna* which heaps up the respective seeds, and which is their ripening. And secondly, the object of the visual sense is "influenced by" the eye faculty (AS_t ad AS 3,6: *de la mig gi khams dbang byed pa nyid*). According to ASBh 2,24f., that means that the external objects (*bāhyaviṣay[āḥ]*) evolve (*nirvartana*) under the influence (*ādhipatyena*) of the physical sense-faculties (*rūpīndriy[āḥ]*). See also SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 343, n. 445, and the *Mahāyānasaṃgrahabhāṣya*, P 5551, *li* 148a3. I agree with BUESCHER (*Vijñānavāda*, p. 67, n. 3), who states that AS 3,3f., goes "beyond the Early Yogācāra stage and explicates the novel theoretical stage", even though I disagree with his understanding of *rūpaprasāda*. Similar to the AS, also Sthiramati's *Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa-vaibhāṣya* (D 4066, fols. 232a1-4) mentions different conditions for the arising of a sense perception, the imprint (**vāsanā*) being one of them, and the object (**ālambana*) another. ● The "classical Yocācāra" *cittamātra* concept of perception is that all three participants in an act of perception, i.e. object, sense faculty, and perception, are nothing but mind. That doctrine is not mentioned in the current AS passage. It appears, e.g., at MSg II.5 (*...gzugs la sogs pa'i phyi'i khams drug...*, see FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 337). ● For *rūpadarśanādi* RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 83, n. 2) glosses both "perception" and "reception." The Tibetan translates "seeing" (*darśana*) in an active sense as "looking at" (... *la lta ba*), and does not use the rather static verb for "seeing" (*mthong ba*). Chinese 能見 also denotes seeing in an active sense ($ASVy_c$ 727b2-3: 取受業者。謂眼等能見色等).

[10] The original $ASBh_t$ translation might also have read *yang na gang rang gi mtshan nyid*.

[11] The translation "supporting" (for *dhāraṇa*) is confirmed by Tibetan *rten pa* ($ASBh_{t,P}$ 57a2).

[12] On the defining effects of the elements, see FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, pp. 96-98. For more details on the doctrine of efficacy (*kāritra*), see FRAUWALLNER, *Studies in Abhidharma*, pp. 189-208, esp. pp. 193-199, and COX, *Disputed Dharmas*, p. 87. ● Note that the definition of a peculiar characteristic (*svalakṣaṇa*) is put into question in *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra*, VII.1: "The Sublime One taught the peculiar characteristic of the *skandha*s in various ways (*paryāya*). [...] The Sublime One also taught that all *dharma*s do not have a nature (*svabhāva*)" (*bcom ldan 'das kyis rnam grangs du mar phung po rnams kyi rang gi mtshan nyid kyang bka' stsal / [...] bcom ldan 'das kyis chos thams cad ngo bo nyid ma mchis pa [...] zhes kyang bka' stsal*). See also FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 289. Such Mahāyānistic considerations are completely absent in the current AS passage. ● RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 83) translates *kāritrakarman* as "l'action d'operation", while Boin-Webb (ASANGA,

Compendium, p. 112) uses "action of function".

[13] This definition of *rūpa* matches that at AS 2,10-14. • Parallels: AKBh 108,9: "Attention to the defining characteristic is as follows: 'matter has the defining characteristic of deformation', and the like" (*svalakṣaṇamanaskāraḥ / tadyathā rūpaṇālakṣaṇaṃ rūpam ity evamādi*). TrBh 41,15: *rūp[aṇ]ālakṣaṇaṃ rūpam*. This reading of BUESCHER (*Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya:*, p. 128,16) should be preferred against LÉVI's *rūpalakṣaṇam*. JACOBI (*Triṃśikāvijñapti*, p. 57) seems to propose the emendation **rūpaṇalakṣaṇaṃ*, as he translates "Stoff (*rūpa*) hat als Merkmal das Prüfen (*rūpaṇa*)." • Canonical sources: For *rūpaṇālakṣaṇaṃ rūpam*, PĀSĀDIKA (*Kanonische Zitate*, p. 47) notes "Quelle des Zitats: Quelle unbekannt". I am not sure whether *iti* here necessarily indicates a sūtra quotation. It is certainly the quotation of a well-known definition of *rūpa*, but that might as well stem from Abhidharma literature. I can only point to SĀ 11b29 (sūtra no. 46), which vaguely resembles the AKBh phrase: "Obstruction is the appropriated *skandha* of matter" (閡是色受陰). See also SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 545f., n. 1459, VETTER, "*Khandha Passages*", p. 21f., and CHOONG, *Sūtrāṅga Portion*, p. 25f. • The concept of *rūpaṇā* addressed here involves some central philosophical issues that played a role in the formation of *cittamātra* idealism. See, e.g., CONZE, *Buddhist Thought in India*, pp. 253-256, SCHMITHAUSEN, "Spiritual Practice and Philosophical Theory", p. 239f., YAMABE, "Self and Other", p. 38, and DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 174. I have collected more materials concerning this issue, but for reasons of time decided to publish them separately.

[14] "Determination" in is this context not at all related to determinism, but to be understood in the sense of a adhering to a strong resolve. • The Sanskrit term *vyavasāya* covers a range between decision, application or even effort. Cf. AS$_t$ *rtsol ba* (effort), AS$_c$ 加行.

[15] Again, the actual "action that is determination" is not the determination or the decision itself, but the action that results from it. • The exact meaning of "and so on" (*-ādi*) is of course doubtful. Judging from common sense, it would be disturbing to use *ādi* if only one further element, i.e. speech (*vāc*), was meant. Still, it can be assumed that the AS author was to some extent aware of the controversy over intention and mental *karman*. Had he wanted to make his stance clear, the author would rather not have used "*ādi*" here, even if two elements, speech and mind, were intended. Later commentators struggled with the issue, as will be seen below. • AS-Mi-pham, p. 456,5: "The *karman* that is determination, of body and speech, prepared by thought" (*sems sngon 'gro lus ngag gi rtsol ba'i las*). • ŚĀKYA MCHOG LDAN explains this to the very contrary: "Here 'the action that is determination' is when doing (*byed bzhin pa*) acts of body, speech, and mind, having made up (*btang*) one's mind before." (*'dir rtsol ba'i las zhes pa ni bsam pa sngon du btang nas lus ngag yid gsum gyi bya ba byed bzhin pa'o //*, AS-Śāk, p. 210,6). The expression *bsam pa sngon du btang ba* is the equivalent for *abhisaṃdhipūrvakaṃ* used in AS$_t$. • Also DPANG LO refers to the "three doors", i.e. body, speech and mind (*rtsol ba'i ni bsam bzhin pa sgo gsum gyi ba ba'o*, AS-dPang, fol. 220a4). To the same effect, AS-'Jam-dbyangs, fol. 279a5: *bsam pa sngon du btang ba'i sgo gsum gyi bya ba rtsol ba'i las*.

---

[16] The term "aim" (*abhisaṃdhi*) is rendered in Tibetan by *bsam pa*. This can lead to confusion with "the karma that follows intention" (*cetayitvā karma*) in its often-used rendering *bsam pa'i las*. • Although the AS section on *karman* does not provide enough information that would allow defining the scope of *abhisaṃdhi* as different from *cetanā* or other related terms, it *can* convey the meaning of an abstract, concealed, or further goal (with "cheating" or "deceiving" among its meanings), or simply that which someone's discourse aims at (the most common usage of *abhi-sam-/dhā* in the AKBh). At AS 85,1-2 (GOKHALE, "Fragments", p. 35,22-24), the term *abhisaṃdhi* is used in the sense of an implicit, hidden intention underlying an instruction by the Buddha. See also ASBh 51,16: *duḥkhavacane 'bhisaṃdhir* (ASBh$_t$: *sdug bsngal nyid kyi tshig tu dgongs pa*). On *abhisaṃdhi* as a hermeneutical term, see JACKSON, *Entrance Gate*, p. 385, n. 56, and id., *Single Means*, p. 107f. • In the AS (just as the AKBh), *abhisaṃdhi* is mostly used to designate the intention underlying a certain teaching exposition. In this AS passage, nonetheless, it conforms to the more common usage in Indian literature as it is documented, for example, in BÖHTLINGK and ROTH, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, s.v. See also BOCK, *Sāgara-Gaṅgāvataraṇa-Mythus*, p. 84, summarizing the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*: The water of the Ganges brings about enjoyment (**bhoga*?) when one bathes in it with a certain aim (*abhisaṃdhipūrvakam*). A similar practice is described in the *Saṅkhārupapatisutta* (MN, no. 120, for this spelling of the title, see VETTER, "*Khandha Passages*", p. 45): In the final moments before his death, a monk directs his thoughts (lit. "mind", *citta*) to a rebirth in the warrior caste. He is accordingly reborn there. Even though the explicit wish for a specific karmic result is formulated *after* a meritorious deed (living the life of a monk) in this case, the concept is similar to that of the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* in so far as one can obtain a specific result from a pious act according to one's wishes. The usage of terminology in the said sutta is highly interesting: Even in such a specific context, the monk "fixes his mind" (*cittaṃ dāhati*) and those impulses (*saṅkhārā*) lead to his rebirth as a *kṣatriya* (See MN III, p. 99,28f.). *Citta* seems to be employed here in a very general sense as "mind" (including the thought contents), and *saṅkhārā* seems to convey the meaning of an explicit "wish." That, again, demonstrates the broad range of meaning in which those terms appear in the suttas.

[17] Like the English word "ornament", Skt. *alaṃkāra* can express the act of adorning, which is in fact the prevalent meaning indicated by BÖHTLINGK and ROTH, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch* (s.v.). ASBh$_t$ renders it as "ornament" in the material sense (*rgyan*), i.e. jewellery. But both ASVy$_t$ and ASVy$_c$ contain verbs that express "making" (造) or "transforming into" ([*la*] *bsgyur*). • RGYAL TSHAB speaks of "a raw piece of gold" (*gser sbram*) instead of "goldsmiths". In his interpretation, it is thus a transformation of some entity that has disappeared as such once the end product is achieved (A into B). That makes the end result clearly the material ornament, while the action (*las*) is the act of transforming. AS-rGyal-tshab, p. 746,6-747,1: "The *karma* that is transformation (*sgyur* [!] *ba'i las*), is like [for example] transforming (*bsgyur ba*) a raw piece of gold into an ornament" (*gser sbram rgyan la sogs par bsgyur ba lta bu sgyur ba'i las*). To the same effect, AS-Bu-ston, p. 515,6: "Transforming, such as making gold into ornaments" (*gser rgyan du byed pa sogs bsgyur ba*).

[18] This is one of the instances where the ASBh discusses the results of spiritual practice in the context of the *karman* section. Note that the concept of *gotra*, which is an important doctrine in the YBh (see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 37f., n. 21, and SUGURO, *Shokiyuishiki*, p. 14), appears nowhere in this section. It was either considered too specific to be mentioned here, or it was considered not to belong in the context of *karman*.

[19] As in the case of *pariṇatikarman*, also with *prāptikarman*, the term *karman* is *possibly* used in the sense of the result (of an action). A transformation (*pariṇati*) that has been achieved in the first case, the possession (*prāpti*) of something in the second. ● RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 83) translates *prāptikarman* as "l'action d'obtention", while Boin-Webb (ASAṄGA, *Compendium*, p. 112) uses "action of acquisition".

[20] The Abhidharma traditions generally agreed that *nirvāṇa* was something to be "obtained", as the expression "having obtained *nirvāṇa*" appears in the sūtra. According to CONZE (*Buddhist Thought in India*, p. 161f.), the Sarvāstivādins, Theravādins, and Mahīśāsakas upheld that *nirvāṇa* existed as factor of its own, while the Sautrāntikas considered *nirvāṇa* to be mere absence, non-existence. In the context of Sarvāstivāda doctrine, CONZE (*op.cit.*, p. 140) tentatively explains the *prāpti* of *nirvāṇa* as "the moment that the *prāpti* of the defiling dharmas is cut off." HIRAKAWA (*Indian Buddhism*, p. 167) in contrast, does not mention *nirvāṇa* when he states that "when the defilements are cut off, the *dharma* of *aprāpti* or dispossession keeps the defilements away". On the discussion about the appropriation of *nirvāṇa* in the AKBh, see also FRAUWALLNER, Philosophie des Buddhismus, pp. 129-139, on Saṅghabhadra's commentary, COX, *Disputed Dharmas*, pp. 90, 185-228. ● The peculiarity of the action that is obtaining is that, although the agent works with effort, nothing is actually produced, but simply an appropriation of an already existing phenomenon (*dharma*) takes place. As for *nirvāṇa*, it is not produced (*saṃskṛta*) and thus can only be attained. ● At first sight it appears unwise to use the attainment of *nirvāṇa* as an example here, considering that we are in a chapter on the Truth of Origination and not on the Truths of Cessation or the Path. On the other hand, the possession of material things as the result of *karman* was a disputed topic that the ASBh author might have tried to avoid. The problem has been seen by BU STON: "Here, the action that is obtaining and so on, the [kinds of] *karman* without inflow are not [factors that belong to] the Truth of Origination, nonetheless, in order to [become] knowledgeable in *karman* in general, they are taught as a supplement (*zhar byung*) to the analysis of karman." (*'dir thob pa'i las la sogs pa zag med kyi las rnams kun byung min yang las spyi la mkhas pa'i ched du / las kyi rab tu dbye'i zhar byung du bstan no //*, AS-Bu-ston, p. 563,2-3).

[21] The fivefold scheme is thus explained to be systematically above the twofold one. The "action that is intention" and the "action after having intended" for the most part fit into the category of "action that is determination".

[22] Unfortunately, the ASBh fails to clarify in how far the action that is obtainment and the action that is efficacy belong to intention and the action that follows intention. "Obtainment", *might* also include any *karman* towards the obtainment of nirvana, i.e. any

---

anāsvarakarman (through which also various kinds of *pratisaṃkhyānirodha* are achieved). In how far can *kāritrakarman* be a conscious act? In fact, in the passage on *acintya*, the *karman* of jewels or medicine are mentioned below (AS 61,14). The *acintya* passage must theoretically be considered to discuss subtopics of either the action that is intention or the action that follows intention–if that twofold scheme is applied to the whole *karman* section (apart from this short passage dealing with the five kinds). This is possibly what the ASBh author had in mind. Factually, the *karman* of inanimate material things does not fit into the twofold scheme. Although animistic ideas can be suspected also in the AS and its commentaries (see my remarks on *ojas* below, ASBh 65,14), they are not to be overestimated. • Cf. AS-Mi-pham, p. 456,4-5: "On this occasion, [it is intended as] the *karman* that is determination" (*skabs 'dir rtsol ba'i las su 'dod do*). Probably, MI PHAM did not want his readers to start wondering in how far the other two kinds of *karman* are relevant here.

[23] Emendation to *yadbhūyasā* against *yadbhūyasyā* in ASBh$_{T}$, ASBh$_{MS}$ 57a3, and SAKUMA (*Index*, pp. 23, 384). The reading proposed in those three sources would be the only occurrence of **yadbhūyasyā* in AS and ASBh, in contrast to AS 7,24 (=AS$_{MS}$ 4a3): *yadbhūyasā*, ASBh 6,16 (= ASBh$_{MS}$ 8a3): *yadbhūyaseti*, and ASBh 46,3: *yadbhūyasā* (ASBh$_{MS}$ 8a3 illegible). Also PRADHAN (AS 53,5) retranslated *yadbhūyasā*. Furthermore, **yadbhūyasyā* is not mentioned in the BHSD (s.v. *yadbhūyasā*). According to WHITNEY, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 470a: *yadbhūyasyā* would be the respective feminine in classical Sanskrit. • GOKHALE (*Fragments*, p. 14) lists *yadbhūyasā* among the "canonical archaisms" of the AS.

[24] Parallels: II.a) AS 6,1: *cetanā cittābhisaṃskāro manaskarma* (=AKBh 54,20), II.b) YBh 60,2f. (*Maulibhūmi*): *cetanā katamā / cittābhisaṃskāraḥ /*, II.c) TrBh 21,4: *cetanā cittābhisaṃskāro manaś ceṣṭā.*, II.d) AK IV.1c: *cetanā mānasaṃ karma.* • Instead of *sems pa'i las gang zhe na* (AS$_{t}$), ASVy$_{t}$ reads *sems pa gang*, as in the definition of *cetanā* at AS 6,1. • There is no equivalent for *cittābhisaṃskāro manaskarma* in AS$_{c}$ and ASVy$_{c}$. Either AS$_{t}$ relies on a later version of the AS or the formula was considered problematic and therefore left out in the AS$_{c}$. • FRAUWALLNER (Philosophie des Buddhismus, p. 167) translates *saṃskārāḥ* as "Willensregungen (=Gestaltungen)". Elsewhere (*op.cit.*, p. 318) he equates *saṃskāra* with *abhisaṃskāra* ("Willensbetätigung"). • Skt. *abhisaṃskāra* is translated by SAKUMA (*Āśrayaparivṛtti*, p. 145) as "reflektiv-voluntativer Impuls". Cf. CONZE (*Buddhist Thought in India*, p. 236): "intellectual activity". • The compound *cittābhisaṃskāra*, could be understood as a.) an impulse (*abhisaṃskāra*) that brings forth a thought (*citta*), or b.) an impulse that consists in a thought. I preliminarily render it as "thought impulse", in analogy to MUROJI, *Pratītyasamutpādavyākhyā*, p. 204f.: "geistige Anstrengung (/ zielgerichtete Aktivität)." Consider also *Karmasiddhi* §45: *yid mngon par 'du byed pa,*; T 1608 (*Karmasiddhi*, Chinese translation by Vimokṣaprajñarṣi, 780c19): 意所作行; and most explicitly *Pratītyasamutpādavyākhyāṭīkā*$_{t,P}$, *chi* 130b8: *yid kyis mngon par 'du byed pa.* • LAMOTTE ("Traité de l'acte", p. 257) translates the phrase *byed pa po'i yid mngon par 'du byed pa* in KSi §45 as "activité (*abhisaṃskāra*) de l'ésprit-agent". In his introduction to the *Karmasiddhi*, LAMOTTE ("Traité de l'acte", p. 155f.) writes: "L'acte mental (*manakarman*) est seulement «volition» (*cetanā*),

c'est-à-dire un mental (une certaine entité mentale) (*caittadharma*) qui accompagne la pensée (*citta*) et lui confectionne (*abhisaṃskṛ-*) une nature morale bonne ou mauvaise". ▪ BHSD (s.v. *abhisaṃskāra*) proposes both, "accomplishment of (proper) thoughts" (in the sense of a.), and "state of mind, right mental make up" (in the sense of b.) for *cittābhisaṃskāra*. Cf. BHSD (s.v. *abhisaṃskaroti*): "makes up the mind, fixes the mind" (with reference to *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, 12.5., *cittam abhisaṃskaroti*). But the same meaning is expressed also without "*cittam*": *uttiṣṭhāmīti cābhisaṃskurvaṃs* (*Lalitavistāra*, 254,20-21) "making up my mind to stand up". BHSD (s.v. *ābhisaṃskāra*): *pāramitābhisaṃskāraṃ ca abhisaṃskaroti* (*Daśabhūmikasūtra*, 55,8-9), "and accomplishes the accomplishment of the Pārāmitās". ▪ Cf. also VETTER ("*Khandha Passages*", p. 41) "intensively confers [fresh] energy to those" (*te* [...] *abhisaṅkharoti*, *Niddesa* I, p. 419,9), "'intensively preparing factors'" (*abhisaṅkhārā*, *Niddesa* I, p. 419,10). The divergence between those two renderings (i.e. between "preparing" and "conferring fresh energy") suggests a rather broad range of meanings that *abhisaṅkharoti* and *abhisaṅkhārā* can possibly have, a range which VETTER actually discusses in detail (*ibid.*, pp. 27-62). ▪ LA VALLÉE POUSSIN quite clearly took citta to be the object of *abhisaṃskāra* ("C'est un «acte d'attention» (*manasikāra*) qui «confectionne» ou «informe» (*abhisamskar*) la pensée et l'acte. La *cetanā* donne une certaine forme à la pensée et la qualifie pour une certaine renaissance, à la différence de la passion (*kleśa*) qui ne porte un fruit de rétribution que lorsqu'elle provoque la *cetanā*. La *cetanā* «confectionne» l'acte; elle fait que le geste est bon ou mauvais." LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, Morale, p. 137). Although he presents these explanations in the context of "Sarvāstivāda" doctrine (by which he means the AKBh), there is no indication that the compound *cittābhisaṃskāra* has to be interpreted fundamentally different in the AS. LA VALLÉE POUSSIN furthermore uses *manasikāra* almost synonymously with *manaskarman*--an issue which I cannot discuss here. ▪ JACOBI (*Triṃśikāvijñapti*, p. 17): "Wille (*cetanā*) ist eine Zurüstung (*abhisaṃskāra*) des Geistes, eine Tätigkeit des inneren Sinnes derart, das während derselben der Geist sich gewissermaßen auf sein Objekt hinbewegt, wie sich Eisen unter dem Einfluß eines Magneten bewegt" (see TrBh 21,4, quoted above), TSONG KHA PA uses the same example when explaining *cetanā*. See ODANI and KELSANG, *Yugagyō shisō*, p. B. 519, and TSONG KHA PA, *Stages of the Path*, vol. 2, p. 62. ▪ TATZ, *Chapter on Ethics*, p. 13: "A wilful action implants a karma formation (*saṃskāra*) in the mind." I assume that this is based on some version of the phrase *cetanā cittābhisaṃskara*. NAGASAWA, *Yugagyō shisō*, p. 311, referring to YBh 60,2f. (see above): 思とは心の造作である ("'Intention' is an activity of the mind."). ▪ As for the etymology of *abhisaṃskāra*, VETTER ("*Khandha Passages*", p. 29, n. 42, quoting CPD, s.v. *abhi-*) notes that in this compound, the prefix *abhi-* (at least in some contexts) seems to "intimate intensity of the action ... or giving an intr. verb a trans. meaning", while *sam-* (in *saṅkhāra*, VETTER, *op.cit.*, p. 32f.) "has no such weight here as to compel [...] lexicographers often to employ 'together' or 'co(n)'." Against other scholars who translate *saṅkhāroti* as 'put together' or 'synthesize', VETTER upholds that in Buddhist scripture, it "basically means 'to improve something, form or prepare it for some purpose.'" ▪ See also below, AS 56,5-6: ***cittābhisaṃskārato***. AS_t (all versions as, well as $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$, and $ASVy_{t,PD}$) uses the genitive (*sems kyi mngon par 'du byed pas*). AS_c (心加行故) does not

specify the case. • See also ZIMMERMANN, *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra*, pp. 148, 174, 330: The phrase *bsod nams mngon par 'du bya ba dang / dge ba mngon pa 'du bya ba* (which I translate as "intentionally bringing fourth merit and wholesome [*karman*]") is found in one version as *bsod nams mngon par 'du bya ba dang / [dge] bas mngon pa 'du bya ba*. Were one to translate the latter phrasing literally, it would mean "intentionally bringing fourth out of [a] wholesome [motivation]". • AS-'Jam-dbyangs (fol. 279b1) explains intention as "mental action that impels (*mngon par 'du byed pa*) the mind (*sems*) towards the deed by exhorting and agitating it (*sems bya ba la bskul zhing g.yo bar mngon par 'du byed pa yid kyi las*)".

[25] HARVEY (*Buddhist Ethics*, pp. 17-19) proposes the translation "karmic fruitfulness" for *puṇya*. He argues against the translations "merit" and "meritorious", saying: "'Meritorious' implies deservingness, but what is referred to is something with a natural power of its own to produce happy results [...], it does not depend on anyone to give out what is due to the 'deserving'". As far as denial of the adjective "meritorious" is concerned, this agrees with MAYRHOFER (*Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, s.v. *puṇya*) who lists only "günstig, glücklich, schön, gut" for the adjective. Anyhow, for the noun *puṇya* MAYRHOFER lists "gutes Werk, Verdienst" and for Pāli *puñña* "Verdienst, Tugend", which makes the implication of "deservingness" HARVEY (see above) denies appear more legitimate. For the negative *apuñña*, CPD (s.v. *apuñña*) proposes: "impure, wicked (as a source of demerit)" for the adjective (as in SN II, p. 81: *apuññaṃ ce saṃkhāraṃ abhisaṃkharoti*), and "sin, demerit" for the noun. Note that HARVEY (op. cit., p. 18f.) mentions *pāpa* as a synonym for *apuñña*. He rejects the translation of *pāpa* as "evil" and proposes "(karmically) deadening" for the adjective and "(karmic) deadness" for the noun. This stands in contradiction to his translation of *sabbapāpassa akaraṇam* as "not to do any evil" (*ibid.*, p. V). • The Chinese equivalent *fu* (福) means, according to TŌDŌ, MATSUMOTO, and TAKEDA, *Kanjigen* (s.v. 福) firstly "happiness, bliss, felicity" (幸い), which they explain as "the [amount of] wealth one has been blessed with by the gods, or, in turn, happiness" (神から恵まれた豊かさ。転じて、しあわせ。). Other Chinese equivalents for *puṇya* are mentioned in NAKAMURA, et al., *Iwanami bukkyōjiten* (s.v. 福德). • BAREAU ("Abhidharmakośakārikā", s.v. *puṇya*) explains the noun as "merit acquired by good actions". As an example, he quotes the AK: "(the gift) to a funeral monument (produces) a merit consecutive to giving up" (*caitye tyāgānvayaṃ puṇyam*, AK IV.121, AKBh 272,7).

[26] Parallels: I.a) DN III, p. 217: *tayo saṅkhārā puññābhisaṅkhāro apuññābhisaṅkhāro āneñjābhisaṅkhāro*. See also SN II, p. 82. II.a) AKBh 227,13: *trīṇi karmāṇi puṇyam apuṇyam āneñjaṃ ca*. • On *āniṃjyaṃ*, AS-Red-mda', fol. 20a2, explains: "[*Karman* leading to immovability is] the intention that makes the mind move towards wholesome [actions] of the material and the immaterial [realm]." (*gzugs gzugs med kyi dge ba la sems g.yo bar byed pa'i sems pa'o*). • For more details on *Karman* leading to immovability, see below, AS 54,21.

[27] In the AS, mental action consisting in magic is neither discussed in the context of the three kinds of action after having intended nor in the context of the ten paths of action.

"The power of the might of the Yogin" in mentioned only in the context of the unthinkable matters is (AS 61,14-15) but, even in the ASBh comments, without any moral judgement. Cf. *Viṃśatikākārikā*, v. 20: A great number of beings is slain as the effect of a seer's (*ṛṣi*) anger. The *Viṃśatikāvṛtti*, p. 10 concludes: "Mental violence (lit. "punishment") is more blameworthy than violence through body or speech" (*manodaṇḍaḥ kāyavāgdaṇḍābhyāṃ mahāvadyatamaḥ*). See also FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 364, 382. ANACKER's translation (*Seven Works*, p. 174) can be misleading: "mental harm through mental action is a greater offence than ...".

[28] Parallel: YBh 206,10-12 (*Savitarkādibhūmi*): *kāyakarma* [...] / *vākkarma* [...] / *manaskarma*. See also YBh$_c$ 323a1-3. • Further references: KSi$_{t,P}$ 167a3: *lus kyi las zhes bya ba 'di yang bstan dgos la / de bzhin du ngag dang yid kyi las* [...]. • To continue the above-mentioned first verse of *Abhidharmakośakārika*, chapter 4: "Intention is action of the mind, and what is born from that: the actions of speech and body." (*cetanā manāsaṃ karma tajjaṃ vākkāyakarmaṇī*, AK IV.1cd). • There is thus a dilemma posed by "mental karma" (*manaskarman*) appearing in both, the explanations of *cetanākarman* as well as *cetayitvā karman*. A handy solution would be to consider the second appearance of *manaskarman* (which all AS versions have) to be a mistake on the part of the author or the earlier manuscript tradition. But this is hardly feasible as that reading has been accepted by XUANZANG, and even by the compiler of the ASVy. The question in what sense mental karma has been classified as following intention requires further research. • ŚĀKYA MCHOG LDAN explains this contradiction by means of a categorization from the AKBh: at AKBh 203,12 (AK IV.10ab) Vasubandhu makes a distinction between an initial motivation (*hetusamutthāna*, *rgyu'i kun slong*, "causal motivation") and the motivation at the time of doing the act (*tatkṣaṇasamutthāna*, *de'i dus kyi kun slong*, "motivation at that moment"). When explained in that way, mental action can be both, intention, and what follows intention. AS-Śāk, p. 210,5-6: "Here, there is no difference in so far as the nature of all action is intention. But, as for the difference when dividing [it] into two: It is divided through the division into (a) the intention which is mainly the causal motivation, and (b) the intention which is mainly the motivation at that moment. And also for those [two] there are three through the division that [those two] occur simultaneously with the actions of body, speech, and mind." (*'dir las thams cad kyi ngo bo sems pa yin pa la khyad par med kyang / gnyis su phye ba'i khyad par ni / rgyu dus kyi kun slong gtso bor gyur pa'i sems pa dang / de dus kyi kun slong gtso bor gyur pa'i sems pa'i dbye bas phye ba yin zhing / de la'ang lus ngag yid gsum gyi bya ba dang lhan cig tu 'jug pa'i dbye bas gsum mo //*). It is noteworthy that although ŚĀKYA MCHOG LDAN's commentary is as whole rather a summary of the AS, he found it necessary to present further details here, even taking a model from the AK into consideration. (I am ignorant as for the appearance of the two kinds of motivation in any source preceding the AK). ŚĀKYA MCHOG LDAN nonetheless makes some reservations as for the applicability of the AK model to the AS, saying that it *cetanā* is the *main, predominant* factor (*gtso bor gyur pa*) in the case of causal motivation, and equally *mainly cetayitvā* in the case of the motivation at that moment. • Those reservations are, to say the least, justified: AK IV.12ab states that one action can have a wholesome causal motivation but an unwholesome "motivation at that moment", etc, i.e. the moral value of those two kinds of

---

motivation can differ. If the two were to correlate to *cetanā* and *cetayitvā*, a wholesome *cetayitvā* action could result from an unwholesome *cetanā* action. I am very doubtful whether the AS doctrine would allow for that. • Bu ston's explanation of the phrase "action that is intention and action after having intended" (*sems pa'i las dang / bsams pa'i las*) resembles AK IV.1cd, but Bu ston leaves no doubt that mental *karman* belongs to both, intention and after having intended (*sems pa yid kyi las dang / des bskyed pa'i bsam pa lus ngag yid gsum gyi las te /*, AS-Bu-ston, p. 515,4-5). • The Sanskrit term *manas* here designates mind in a very general sense, as different from more specific uses of the term (e.g. in the context of the twelve *dhātus*). See NAKAMURA, et al., *Iwanami bukkyōjiten*, s.v. 意(身口意の意). In its more general sense, *manas* is basically considered synonymous with *citta* and *vijñāna* in Yogācāra Abhidharma. See, e.g. FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 366, SCHMITHAUSEN, *Sautrāntika-Voraussetzungen*, p. 119, and PAHLKE, *Vijñāna-Abschnitt des Pañcaskandhaka*, p. 30f.

[29]Parallels: AKBh 192,12: *kāyavāṅmanaskarmāṇi*. AKBh 204,01: *kuśalākuśalāni*. TrBh 18,10: *kuśalākuśalam*.

[30] One may wonder why the category of "undetermined" (*avyākṛta*) *karman* is not mentioned here or below, at AS 54,22-55,1. Although the issue of undefined intention (*cetanā*, i.e. *karman*) is not mentioned in this passage, the AS clearly asserts "undefined" *karman* at AS 24,1f. There, bodily and verbal *karman* can be undefined (due to their motive, *utthānatas*) if they are motivated (*samutthāpita*) by a certain kind of mind (*citta*), or secondary mental factors. In fact, that *karman* can be undetermined is presupposed quite naturally in a number of commentaries, such as AKBh 227,4f. (see also AKBh 201,1, FUKUHARA, *Gōhon, zuiminbon*, p. 27, and the references in KRAGH, *Action and Result*, p. 340f.). A threefold classification (of *dharmas*) into wholesome, unwholesome, and undetermined is already found in the earliest Abhidharma texts (see FRAUWALLNER, *Studies in Abhidharma*, p. 5). • And at first sight, such a threefold classification (good, bad, neither-nor) comes in handy for the scholastic project of categorizing the things in the world, and indeed it seems to have enjoyed some popularity (see Erb, *Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti*, p. 192, n. 889) but, as I already stated in the introduction, *karman* always played a bit of a special role in the scholastic *dharma* scheme, where it was included only as *cetanā* (and, by some scholary traditions, as *rūpa* in the form of *vijñapti-* and *avijñapti-rūpa*). A *cetanā*, in turn, that was neither wholesome nor unwholesome was not forceful (*balavat*) enough to bring about a karmic ripening (*vipāka*), so there was little practical use in calling it *karman* (see also KRAMER, *Fünf*-vastu-*Abschnitt*, p. 130f., n. 155). According to NYANATILOKA (*Buddhist Dictionary*, Appendix, s.v. *avyākata*), "this term in the sense of 'amoral' or 'karmically neutral' does not occur in the old sutta texts", which makes sense, as we cannot expect the Buddha to say: "This is what I did not determine". And the aim of earliest Buddhism was primarily soteriological, only hesitatingly moral, but far away from the Abhidharma attempt to classify just everything (*sarva*). • I guess it is for the above reasons that the issue of undetermined karman plays a minor role in the developed Abhidharma literature, especially in the AS Dharmaviniścaya section which is built around sūtra passages. The category "undetermined" is discussed

with some vigour, but rather in the context of soteriology, when false attitudes are to be given up by constant practice, even though they are morally undetermined–which refers to mental factors, not karmically relevant actions (see also my notes ad ASBh 65,13-14, *tasyā mohabhūyastvāt*). The category "undetermined" also plays a role in the discussions about the *ālayavijñāna*. See LAMOTTE, "Traité de l'acte", p. 240f., n. 88, p. 243f., and p. 262, n. 150, and the references in SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 617. ▪ By the way, the doctrine that the ripening of *karman* is *nivṛta-avyākṛta*, as implicitly presupposed by SUGURO (*Shokiyuishiki*, p. 23f.: "connected to the nature of defilements"), is not known to me. According to AKBh 88,2f., the result of karman is *anivṛta-avyākṛta*. See MUROJI, *Pratītyasamutpādavyākhyā*, p. 158, n. 202 and SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 153f. See also KRAGH, *Action and Result*, p. 323. *Karmavipāka* is *somehow* related to defilements (as long as it does not belong to the *mārgasatya* or *nirodhasatya*), but that makes it *sāsrava*, not *nirvṛta*. Whether *vijñāna* is ultimately *sāsrava* is a different question, at least on this level of scholastic analysis. ▪ A final word: An often used example for *avyākṛtakarman* is craftsmanship (VinSg$_{t,P}$ 31a2 *bzo'i gnas*, YBh$_{c}$ 589b15 工巧) , and the fact that it is not considered wholesome shows how reserved the Buddhist scholars were with regard to mundane productivity: working and producing as such are not necessarily good. ● The definition at AS 5,23-6,2 (Skt. preserved) actually defines *cetanā* as "urging the mind towards what is wholesome, in what is either wholesome, unwholesome, or undetermined." (*kuśalākuśalāvyākṛteṣu cittapreraṇa*, *dge ba dang mi dge ba dang lung du ma bstan pa rnams la sems 'jug par byed*). ● Only AS$_{t,P}$ supports the word order given by PRADHAN. All the other versions, including the Chinese, mention what is wholesome (*kuśala*) first, and what is unwholesome second (AS$_{c}$, ASVy$_{c}$ 或善或不善.). A similar case is YBh 170,20 (in the *Savitarkādibhūmi*) where BHATTACHARYA's edition (followed by AYMORÉ) reads *te punar akuśalāḥ kuśalāś ca daśa karmapathāḥ* [sic]. Nonetheless, according to AYMORÉ (*Karma*, p. 37, n. 13), the YBh MS (where sandhi before initial *a* is rarely executed) has: *te punaḥ akuśalāḥ akuśalāś*, with the second prefix "*a*-" erased. The respective phrase in YBh$_{t,PD}$ (AYMORÉ, *Karma*, p. 37+) is *de dag kyang dge ba dang / mi dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam rnams* te. Chinese version: YBh$_{c}$ 315a22: 此復二種。即善不善十種業道. I therefore think that also YBh 170,20 should be emended to *te punar kuśalā akuśalāś ca daśa karmapathāḥ*, even though the following enumeration of paths of action in the YBh mentions the unwholesome actions first (e.g. *prāṇātipātaḥ prāṇātipātaviratiś ca*). Cf. also AS$_{t,P}$ 102a2 (ad AS 54,11-12): *dge ba dang mi dge ba'i las*. ▪ It should be noted that XUANZANG was not very strict about preserving the word order in general. See NAGAO, ed., *Index to Asaṅga's Mahāyānasaṃgraha*, p. xi: "[In XUANZANG's translations] there are many cases in which, in order to convey the meaning more clearly, the word order has been changed, the order of sentences is inverted, and so on." An example can be found at AK IV.22ab (*asaṃvarasthaḥ śubhayāśubhayā saṃvare sthitaḥ* [...]). XUANZANG changed the word order to have the (pure) restraints stand first and the bad restraints stand second. The terms "pure" and "impure" are changed accordingly so that "impure" stands first (住律不律儀 起染淨無表, T 1558 47a4). In this case, the reversal was probably undertaken to avoid *住不律律儀. In Chinese, the negation by 不 preferably stands second in such alternative pairs. XUANZANG then reverses the sentences in the explanatory prose

accordingly (AKBh 210,15-17; T 1558 47a6-9). But cf. T 1821, p. 270c27: 不善善業道. ▪ In my above translation "pure" and "impure" as translations for *śubha* and *aśubha* have to be understood in the moral sense. SCHMITHAUSEN (*Ālayavijñāna*, p. 229) translates "good" and "evil".

[31] Canonical sources: Pāli suttas mention the ten unwholesome actions, e.g., MN I, no. 9 (*Sammādiṭṭhisutta*), MN III, p. 47, etc. For lists, see NYANATILOKA, *Buddhist Dictionary*, s.v. *kammapatha*, and THANISSARO BHIKKHU, *Wings to Awakening*, p. 34f. ● Further references: AKBh 248,13: *daśākuśalāḥ karmapathāḥ*. See also AK IV.73-78c (AKBh 243,12-248,1).

[32] *Karmapatha* (Tib. *las kyi lam*; Chin. 業道) has become a central technical term in Abhidharmic *karman* exposition, wherefore I translate it rather mechanically as "path of action". LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (*Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 137) renders it as "chemin-de-l'acte", RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 85) "sortes d'action". BÖHTLINGK and ROTH, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung* (s.v.): "die Richtung, die eine Handlung nimmt, eine Art von Handlung". It should be noted that the Sanskrit terms used to describe the ten *karmapatha*s are nouns, some not traceable to a verbal root (e.g. *paiśunya*), and even the verbal nouns describe the concrete actions often in quite abstract terms, such as "... wrong behaviour" (*... mithyācāra*), "... view" (*... dṛṣṭi*) and so on. The Ābhidharmikas held on to that theory because, I think, they struggled with the difficulty of fitting *karman* into the *dharma* scheme anyhow. Usually, *dharma*s were described by means of their action ("*...karmika*"), not the other way around. Or, put it less scholastically, because it was difficult to nail down something as fleeting and invisible as an action to a proper scholarly description–and I think it is for that same reason that we often find quite rare and abstract terms in contemporary legal literature ("homicide", "tax evasion", etc.). At YBh 171,6-181,6 the *persons* (*pudgalāḥ*!) who commit each of the ten unwholesome and wholesome *karmapatha*s are described, and the section contains a short excursus on legal cases at YBh 180,11-14 (see AYMORÉ, *Karma*, pp. 77-114). The rather concrete metaphor *path* was possibly chosen to counteract the otherwise abstract terminology, and/or to allow for a temporal extension of an otherwise momentary *dharma*, action. ● The term *karmapatha* is explained in AKBh 248,1-9. BHSD (s.v.) contains some remarks on its history. See also below, ASBh 63,12.

[33] $AS_{t,P}$ renders *kāmamithyācāra* as *'dod pas log par g.yem pa*, which is in accordance with *Mahāvyutpatti* 1689, while $AS_{t,D}$ (*'dod pa la log par g.yem pa*) suggests a *locativus objectivus* (see WHITNEY, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 307b), as in the common Pāli phrase *kāmesu micchācāra* (MN III, p. 46f., etc.). See also YBh 174,14 (ed. AYMORÉ): *kāmeṣu cāritram*. The Tibetan equivalents are of course not necessarily based on philologically tenable etymologies. ● RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 83): "luxure"; Boin-Webb (ASAṄGA, *Compendium*, p. 113): "sensuality". Note that RAHULA (*ibid.*) translates *kāmamithyācārād viratiḥ* (Pradhan's retranslation) as "abstention d'adultère".

[34] This passage is a good example of XUANZANG's translation method (echoed in PRADHAN's retranslation). Although the list is abbreviated by means of *yāvad* in the original text, XUANZANG presents all the ten items (離殺生離不與取離欲邪行離誑語離

離間語離麁惡語離雜穢語).

[35] "In order of importance" (*yathāpradhānaṃ*) here means that only the most important ten among all karmically relevant actions are mentioned (excluding also some of those actions belonging to the preparation, and so on). The *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* is more explicit on this issue. "From [the point of view of] the grave ones among those, the ten paths of action are stated" (*tadaudārikasaṃgrahāt / daśa karmapathā uktāḥ*) says Vasubandhu in the verses (AK IV.66b-c), and gives the following explanation in the commentary: "Among exactly those good acts and bad acts, the ten paths of action, are stated in the sūtra by means of a collection of the grave ones" (*teṣām eva sucaritaduścaritānāṃ caudārikasaṃgrahena daśa karmapathāḥ sūtra uktāḥ*, AKBh 238,5). • The same idea is expressed by SGAM PO PA in his *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan* (p. 55): "In general there are many [kinds of demeritorious karman], but condensed through the paths of action [they are] the ten unvirtuous actions" (*spyir mang na yang las kyi lam gyis bsdus pa mi dge ba bcu ste /*). • Sāgaramegha, in his commentary on the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, seems to hold a different opinion, i.e. that the minor actions are not implied in the ten major ones: "The major ('extensive', *rgya che ba*) [kinds of] bad conduct (*nyes par spyod pa*) are condensed through the paths of action. [The kinds of bad conduct] that are not major are not condensed through the paths of action." (ACIP TD4047, fol. 10b: *nyes par spyod pa rgya che ba ni las kyi lam gyis bsdus pa'o // rgya che ba ma yin pa ni las kyi lam gyis bsdus pa ma yin pa'o //*). • Cf. ASVy$_c$ 727b14: "Now, that in this [text] only the paths of action are proclaimed to be the action of the body, and so on..." (今於此中唯以業道顯身等業者).

[36] Also the AKBh clearly states that the bodily activities counted as preparation and completion do not belong to the paths of action themselves: "As for the unwholesome paths of action, a part of the bad bodily acts is not included among them–that of those which are preparation and completion", *akuśaleṣu tāvat (tāvat*; AKBh$_{MS}$ *tāt*; AKBh (ed. PRADHAN) *tat*. Cf. AKBh$_t$ *re zhig) karmapatheṣu kāyaduścaritasya pradeśo na saṃgṛhītaḥ prayogapṛṣṭhabhūtaḥ*, AKBh 238,7. But also other minor "defiled" actions are unwholesome, although not included in the list of ten ("Also [any] other defiled act [is not included], like fettering and so on", *kliṣṭaś cānyo 'pi bandhanādiḥ*, AKBh 238,8. In the AKBh example, "fettering" is an act of preparation for killing.). The same applies for minor verbal or mental acts, be they wholesome or unwholesome (AKBh 238,8-12, for more details, see the footnotes in LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 137f.). Vasubandhu makes a distinction between physical and vocal paths of action (which require preparation, *prayoga*, and an aftermath, *pṛṣṭha*) on the one hand, and mental paths of action on the other hand (which are complete by the mere appearance of, e.g., harmful intent, in the mind, AKBh 239,15-19). ASBh 64,7-8, in contrast, mentions a preparation (*prayoga*) for covetousness and a disposition (*āśaya*) for both covetousness and wrong views. The list in the ASBh does not aim at completeness, so that other factors (like defilements, *kleśa*) are also imaginable for the mental paths of action. The aftermath (*pṛṣṭha*) of the AKBh is of special interest because it includes a later rejoicing, a model which opens the door to an annihilation of *karman* by means of repentance also for lay people. See LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Morale*, p. 206. See also SCHMITHAUSEN, *Buddhism*

and Nature, p. 52f. • The Mahāyānistic *Daśākuśalakarmapathāḥ* also deals with *karman* under five aspects. Their names are not mentioned in the passages edited by LÉVI ("Autour d'Aśvaghoṣa", p. 268f.), but they mostly match the AS scheme, the only difference being that the apprehension of the object is distinguished from the intention (e.g., *vādhakacitta* in the case of killing), and that no *kleśa* is mentioned. The passage reads (my numbering): *tatra katham prāṇātipāti bhavati* / (1.) *prāṇī ca bhavati* (2.) *prāṇasaṃjñī ca bhavati* (3.) *vādhakacittañ ca pratyupasthitam bhavati* (4.) *upakramaṃ ca karoti* (5.) *jivitād vyavaropayato etāḥ pañca.* I am indebted to Iain SINCLAIR for bringing this text to my attention.

[37] A slightly different set of five aspects (*rnam pa*) is mentioned at VinSg$_{t,D}$ 131b5: Object (*gzhi*), apperception (*'du shes*), disposition (*bsam pa*; **āśaya*?), defilement (*nyon mongs pa*), and end (*mtha'*).

[38] AKBh 239,11-240,14 presents more details about the various steps for a complete path of action, albeit within the framework of its threefold classification (preparation, *prayoga*; main act, *maula*; aftermath, *pṛṣṭha*). See also MCDERMOTT, *Early Buddhist Concept of Kamma*, p. 180. The threefold set of the AKBh is actually a merely chronological classification, while the AS here distinguishes 1. emotional predisposition and 2. rational ascertainment (i.e. two psychological aspects), 3. the patient of the act, and 4. the act itself. Also in the twofold set of 1.) preparation and 2.) completion (AS 55,4ff.), the explanation of the AS is purely psychological.

[39] For the interpretation of *vastu* as "external object", see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 479, n. 37.

[40] EDGERTON (BHSD, s.v. *āśaya*) translates this term as "mental disposition, intent." "Disposition" fits quite well considering that in its non-figurative usage, *āśaya* denotes a resting place, or a seat. See BÖHTLINGK and ROTH, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch* (s.v. *āśaya*): "1) Lagerstatt, Sitz [...]; 5) Gedanken, Absicht; 6) Gesinnungs-, Denkweise", but note that CDP s.v. *āsaya*) places "wish, intention" before "mental state, heart, disposition". Cf. CONZE, *Buddhist Thought in India*, p. 75: "intention".

[41] It seems that when dealing with the term *saṃjñā*, any term that would cover the whole range of its meanings would be too unspecific as to distinguish it clearly from *vijñāna*. In the context of *karman* doctrine, *saṃjñā* usually denotes a clear identification of the object [to be stolen, lied about, etc.]. I translate *saṃjñā* here as "apperception", which is a minimal form of identification, a simple awareness of what it is that one perceives. As far as I understand, "apperception" does not necessarily imply thinking in words ("this is that"), but it does not exclude this either. I would like to add some reflections on the range of meanings of *saṃjñā*. The equivalent "apperception" stems from VETTER (*Ideas and Meditative Practices*, p. 36, n. 6) and SCHMITHAUSEN, "Ecological Ethics", p. 58. Other equivalents are found, for example, in SAKUMA, *Āśrayaparivṛtti*, vol. 2, p. 99, n. 694 ("begrifflich, sprachlich strukturierte Vorstellung"), SCHMITHAUSEN, "Liberating Insight", p. 214f., n. 51 ("ideation"), or MAY, "Idéaliste", p. 273 ("synthèse intellectuelle", focusing on the aspect of association). Discussing the definition of *saṃjñā* at AKBh 10,15-16, DELEANU, (*Mundane Path*, p. 481, n. 41) has opted for a the rather broad

equivalent "perception", which, I think, should be reserved for translating *vijñāna*, the nonconceptual internal repesentation of an external sense object. *Vijñāna* seems to fit the undestanding of "perception" in the sense of "awareness of environment through physical sensation" (see *Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, s.v.), including the perception of mental images, sounds, etc. LEIBNIZ' theory of apperception is properly summarized in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, s.v. attention. • The equivalent "apperception" seems to be fully valid in the context of the Abhidharma theory on how incoming sense data are processed in the mind: *saṃjñā* is one necessary step in that process, and it is that very function of *saṃjñā* that explanations of the *saṃjñā-skandha* normally focus on. Nonetheless, *saṃjñā* and related terms such as *saṃjñin* have a much broader meaning (see, e.g. SCHMITHAUSEN, *Sentience of Plants*, p. 2, n. 9), even in Abhidharma literature. For the *saṃjñā-skandha*, I would like to propose that six coordinates are of major importance for distinguishing its semantic field: 1a) forming a new association, such as learning the word "elephant" in connection with seeing an elephant, vs. 1b) remembering an association, such as seeing an elephant and knowing what it is; 2a) habitual association, such as habitually attributing the conception of a waterfall to the sound of a waterfall, vs. 2b) deliberate association, such as actively imagining that the Buddha is like a physician, the Dharma like medicine, etc.; 3a) internal verbalization, such as internally hearing the words "this is blue" upon seeing something blue (which hardly happens to animals), vs. 3b) non-verbal association, such as having a glimpse of an image of a waterfall upon hearing the sound of a waterfall. Rather than delineating the borders of that semantic range, Abhidharma authors tended to present single points within that range, or, more precisely, within the range they themselves accepted. See also SCHMITHAUSEN, "Weiteres Fragment aus dem Prakaraṇa", p. 62, n. 20. • Of course, a *saṃjñā* can also be mistaken, for example thinking that something is permanent when it is actually impermanent (*dmigs pa mi rtag pa la rtag go zhes mtshan mar 'dzin pa*, $\text{VinSg}_{t,P}$ 43b4, $\text{VinSg}_{t,D}$ 41a6f.), that something is joy (*sukha*) when it is actually suffering (*duḥkha*), etc. • My delineation of the above-mentioned semantical field has only been possible due to previous thorough philological research such as conducted VETTER ("*Khandha Passages*", pp. 24-27). VETTER (*ibid.*) has also refined his earlier view that "apperception" is the most fitting equivalent for *saṃjñā/saññā*, limiting this interpretation to the Sarvāstivāda definition as found at AK I.14: There, the *saṃjñāskandha* is defined as "taking up (or, taking out, *udgrahaṇa*) the sign (or, defining characteristic, *nimitta*) of an object" (*saṃjñā nimittodgrahaṇātmikā*; my translation; to the same effect, the definition of the secondary mental factor *saṃjñā* at AKBh 54,19f.). I would like to add a few observations to this: The verbal noun *udgrahaṇa* employed here is highly metaphorical, using a bodily action to describe a mental process, and it is indeed similar to English expressions like "picking up" something, "grasping" something, and the like (I will abstain from commiting to one equivalent). It seems to mean "picking out" of a mass of sensory data those that allow the identification of the object perceived on the one hand with an object remembered on the other, i.e. identifying those labels of the object perceived with those labels that one has stored as specific identifiers. Strictly speaking, as far as I understand, only *vijñāna* should be in contact with the sense objects via the sense faculties. VETTER (*op.cit.*, p. 26) states that the word *udgrahaṇa* suggests that "one does not produce *nimitta*s", to which I can only partly agree. It seems that by the AK definition, one does not necessarily produce

new *nimittas*, i.e. new identifiers for objects one may encounter in the future. Even though I wonder how the process of learning is then explained in the AK, it appears quite reasonable that *udgrahaṇa* should as a rule refer to a process of identification (in the sense of recognition) if is to be an omnipresent mental process. A slightly different question is whether the process of *udgrahaṇa*, being completely mental, cannot *involve* "producing" a mental label on top of the mental image which is the *vijñāna* (a visual mental image, for example, in the case of visual perception), or, to put it in other words, re*producing* the identifier from one's memory (see also JAINI, "*Smṛti*", p. 49). ▪ My surmize that *nimittas* can be brought forth as an internal representation of the external *nimitta* is partly confirmed by DELHEY (*Samāhitā Bhūmiḥ*, p. 43f., see also p. viii), with the restriction that in the passages analyzed by DELHEY, "taking up" (*udgṛṇāti*) an external *nimitta* and reproducing it internally seems to refer only to the *nimitta* acutely perceived *and not* to the identifier (as I call it). This internal representation of the *nimitta* acutely perceived is only then stored in memory for later reproduction in meditation practice—at least this is my reading of DELHEY's interpretation. ▪ Returning to the AK I.14 definition, the word *udgrahaṇa* gives the impression of "taking up" something that is actually there, which would then suggest that does not "produce" either overblown concepts or wrong concepts on the base of what one has taken up. Still, some among the *nimittas* that can be "taken up" some are actually quite abstract. "Friend" or "foe" (*mitrāmitra*, AKBh 10,16, ad AK I.14), for example, can involve a high degree of interpretation. ▪ In most instances, nonetheless, VETTER (*ibid.*) would opt against the rendering "apperception", and, having analyzed a wealth canonical material, points to *Visuddhimagga* XIV.130 as an example. In this case, too, I basically agree with him, and I would like to add a few observations: Buddhaghosa describes *saññā* under several different aspects, the last three being its "function" (*rasa*, which is the equivalent used by Bhikkhu NYANAMOLI, *Path of Purification*, p. 520), its "manifestation" (*paccuppaṭṭhāna*) and its proximate cause (*padaṭṭhāna*). Its function is (in NYANAMOLI's translation): "to make a sign (*nimittakaraṇa*) as a condition for perceiving (*sañjānanappaccaya*) again (*puna*) that 'this is' the same (*tad evetan ti*), as carpenters ... do in the case of timber." I do not know the details of the carpenter simile, but it seems to tell us of carpenters who scribe a sign on a piece of wood so that they can recognize it later. The easiest adaptation of that simile to mental processes is forming a new association, such as, say learning the name or a person while associating it to that persons face, or a child learning a new designation for a specific thing. Nonetheless, I do not think learning is exclusively meant here. BHIKKHU BODHI (*Manual of Abhidhamma*, p. 80) uses the carpenter simile by saying that "[*Saññā*'s] procedure is compared to a carpenter's recognition of certain kinds wood by the mark he has made on each." BHIKKHU BODHI's phrasing is, to be sure, not meant as a literal translation of the *Visuddhimagga*, but it is a noteworthy interpretation of a simile which I am not very certain about. As the most probable interpretation of this "function", I would like to propose "labeling" something, even if it is just for an instant, like, for example, a monk who is in charge of a thousand butter lamps before him. When he sees that one is running out of fuel, he labels it as "empty" in his mind just for an instant, just for the few moments that it takes him to fill it up again. He would be a fool if he would try to memorize the attribute "empty" with that lamp for the future. There is thus a variety of possible interpretations of the carpenter simile and all can be located

somewhere within the semantical field I outlined above. ▪ Buddhaghosa then goes on to explain the "manifestation" (*paccuppaṭṭhāna*) of *saññā*, and it manifests as "making a conviction" (*abhinivesakaraṇa*, my translation) on account of sign one has grasped (*gahita*(!)-*nimitta-vasena*,), like "the blind who 'see' (*dassaka*) an elephant". Again, I am not absolutely certain about the simile, but it is normally related to the parable where blind men are asked to describe an elephant, after each of them had touched a different part of its body (*Khuddakanikāya*, Ud 6.4). The one who has felt the leg says "it is like a pole", and so on. In that story, the blind man forms a new notion of an elephant based on 1. the tactile data from his touching the object, 2. the auditory data from his being told "this is an elephant", and 3. previous identifiers for another object, in this case obviously, "what feels cylindrical and upright" is a "pole." Henceforth, if something feels cylindrical and upright, those tactile informations can also indicate an elephant–a process of learning, although, unfortunately, wrong. It seems that Buddhaghosa here primarily exemplify the process of overinterpretation, forming a notion (as the word *abhinivesa* suggests) on the base of meagre sensual date, even though he quite clearly ascribes the ability to construct mental visual images to blind men (as the word *dassaka* suggests; the visual aspect resembles a "Sautrāntika" position at AKBh 195,8, where it is said *vijñāna* perceives one point per moment, while it is *saṃjñā* that constructs a shape out of it; and at ŚrBh 429,10f., "taking in" the *nimitta* of an object can be done by means of an effigy of that object, which suggests that *nimitta* in that context means visual appearance of either the whole object or some features of it; the *nimitta* of the object thus taken in is later reproduced on meditation practice, and this reproduction surely means visualization—see SCHMITHAUSEN, "Aspects of Spiritual Practice", p. 226). I agree with Vetter that "apperception" would be not be the right description for the process of forming a new conviction. Another noteworthy aspect of this story is that the blind men physically touch the object, and not only that, it seems that they grasp (hence *gahita*) only one out of the various body parts of the elephant. With that in mind, one could actually apply the Sanskrit term "*udgrahaṇa*" in the literal sense to this story, an in this respect the Theravāda parable and the Sarvāstivāda metaphorical term are similar. ▪ Thirdly Buddhaghosa goes on to explain that the "proximate cause" of a *saññā* is an object, which I take to mean normally an object of a sense perception, such as a visual appearance. His simile is that of deer having a *saññā* of a man ("*purisātī*") when they see a scarecrow. I would hardly consider this a process of learning, as learning would lead to the understanding that a scarecrow is *similar to* a man, and neither do they use the scarecrow to learn what a man is. What happens is that they see something that has some specific characteristics of a man. They focus on those characteristics and identify the scarecrow as a man, an erroneous identification, again. ▪ Of the three examples Buddhaghosa uses, two describe a faulty identification or interpretation based an a choice of sense data or characteristics. This is a quite different tone from, for example, the definition of the *saṃjñā-skandha* in the AS (AS 2,16-18, ASBh 2,16-18; AS 5,4-13, ASBh 4,11-17), where a faulty *saṃjñā* is not even worth mentioning among the many forms of *saṃjñā* described, although a faulty *saṃjñā* is surely considered possible. That difference between the *Visuddhimagga* and the AS may hint at slightly different objectives of the two works. Possibly, at least as far as the explanation of *saṃjñā* is concerned, the *Visuddhimagga* was more occupied with soteriological concerns while the AS aimed

more at a complete classification of phenomena, putting concepts in order. The *Visuddhimagga* in this case seems to be more critical of the ordinary mind, with a tendency to describe the usual workings of the mind as prone to error. This can be likened to NYANAPONIKA (*Geistestraining durch Achtsamkeit*, p. 151f., see also p. 18), who warns against the dangers of our habitual observation and judgement of only a part of the aspects of any phenomenon or situation (my paraphrase), and his warning matches, in fact, the original didactic intent of the elephant story. The AS probably presents a more descriptive, less judgemental treatment of the same issue, and a modern example of such an approach would be BHIKKHU BODHI's note on *saññā*, where he does *not* address its shortcomings and uses the carpenter example exclusively (*Manual of Abhidhamma*, p. 80), interpreting it in the sense of "recognition", (which is also the equivalent used by GETHIN, *Foundations of Buddhism*, p. 136, and which I understand as "identification of a thing or person from previous encounters or knowledge", cf. VETTER, *op.cit.*, p. 25). In a similar manner, NĀRADA (*Manual of Abhidhamma*, p. 84f.), commenting upon the same passage, does not mention faulty *saññā*, even going so far as to talk of "the wild animal's discernment in the scarecrow of the work of man" (NĀRADA's valuable discussion of *saññā* addresses several important questions. Unfortunately I cannot deal with it in detail for lack of time). *If* it is true, then, that there is a more soteriological approach to *saññā* and a more descriptive, analytical one, then, as a rule of thumb, the soteriological approach has to be assumed the original one. I think this is partly supported by some of VETTER's findings in the canon (*op.cit.*, p. 25): in some passages, *saññā* is depicted as something to be overcome, or the verb *sañjānāti* is used to describe someone's having an unreflected and wrong conception, for example thinking the earth is [simply] the earth, and so on. Still, *sañjānāti* is also used in the context of meditation practice (*ibid.*) where it does not seem to have a negative connotation. • I cannot enter into a detailed discussion of the axis between the poles 3a) and 3b) in the semantical field of *saṃjñā*, i.e. the question of internal verbalization. In how far and under which circumstances does *saṃjñā* imply that one thinks in words and hears them internally? The fact that the content of *saṃjñā* is often expressed in sentences ending in *iti* may suggest that it this kind of thinking about an object which is actually meant by *saṃjñā*. Still I do not assume that deer, for example, are believed to think in words, and neither is that necessarily implied by *iti*. A distinction between the *saṃjñā* of those who are conversant with *vyavahāra* (≈language), and of those who are not, is made at ASBh 4,11-17. Since there are many points worth discussing here (such the relation between *nimitta* and *vyavahāra*!), I have to leave this passage for a later analysis. Basically, I tend to assume that many Abhidharma authors did not have a clear definition of the amount of verbalization *saṃjñā* implies, and that this question was mostly not considered essential. Therefore, as a modern researcher, I cannot be very definitive about it either. Judging from the occurrences of *saṃjñā* I have seen, I assume that mental speaking *can* fall under *saṃjñā*, but that it does not have to be there in every case. • The meaning of *saṃjñā* may radically change when it is taught to occur during states of unconsciousness. Phases of unconsciousness present a problem for Buddhist systematics: The materialists could easily claim that mind is only a function of the body, and that it works properly when the body is unaffected. The proponents of an *ātman*, on the other hand, may hold that the "I" or the "Self" is unaffected by such trivial things as unconsciousness. For the Buddhist

scholars, the eighteen-*dhātu* model reached its limits, and was pushed beyond them, when it came to explaining such phenomena. For states of unconsciousness, some invoked the *ālayavijñāna*, no matter whether the unconsciousness is due to a physical/medical condition or to special meditative states. It is difficult to find a term to translate *vijñāna* in this context: In what I would call the "classical" eighteen-*dhātu* model, the word "*vijñāna*" can properly be translated as "perception", but in the case of the *ālayavijñāna*, one often gets the impression of a mental continuum perpetuating itself without dependence on objects of perception. Still, the *ālayavijñāna* is in some sources said to have an object (see SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 403f., n. 717), and even to be endowed with secondary mental factors, such as *saṃjñā*. Such claims were probably made for the sake of dogmatic coherence, as is quite evident for states of unconsciousness. In such a case, of course, the equivalent "apperception" may be systematically appropriate but it is factually out of place, and so are, I assume, other equivalents such as "perception" or "cognition". ▪ Looking at the AS, the explanations that *could* imply that the *ālayavijñāna* is accompanied by *saṃjñā* (AS 30,20f.) are not very explicit, maybe even unintelligible, and so is the respective commentary at ASBh 44,15-20. This in turn *could* indicate that neither the AS author nor his commentator felt really confident when dealing with this issue. ▪ The *ālayavijñāna* is a brilliant invention that shares many features with what contemporary psychology calls "the unconscious" (hence WALDRON's title "The Buddhist Unconscious"). It would be fundamentally enlightening here to enquire into the Theravāda commentarial explanation of states of unconsciousness of time I can only offer some glimpses of contemporary literature: The Theravāda commentarial concept of *bhavaṅga-citta* derives its name from the mind at the point of death and rebirth, which corresponds to *bhava*, the tenth *aṅga* of the *paṭiccasamuppāda*. The *bhavaṅga-citta* fills the gaps between moments of *viññāna* (perception in the "classical" sense), and the question of its object and its relation to *saññā*. A quite detailed discussion of *bhavaṅga-citta* can be found in NĀRADA MAHĀ THERA's notes to the *Manual of Abhidhamma* (pp. 162-166). NĀRADA reports that "some identify *bhavaṅga* with with sub-consciousness", a view which he rejects as "one experiences only one thought-moment at any particular time" and "no two thought-moments coexist." In another opinion (Aung and Mrs. Rhys-Davis), *bhavaṅga* is likened to "Leibnitz's state of obscure perception, not amounting to consciousness, in dreamless sleep." NĀRADA rejects that, too, "because *bhavaṅga* is a type of consciousness", having already stated that "each thought moment hangs on to some kind of object", and "no consciousness arises without an object, either mental or physical." Still, he notably does not mention what, then, the object of the *bhavaṅga-citta* is and instead explains that "when an object enters this stream [of *bhavaṅga*] through the sense-doors, the *bhavaṅga* consciousness is arrested and another type of consciousness appropriate to the object perceived arises." ▪ Different from NĀRADA's approach, BHIKKHU BODHI (*Manual of Abhidhamma*, p. 122f.) completely refrains from insisting that the *bhavaṅga-citta* has an object. He rather presents a calm and non-controversial presentation of its functions, avoiding problems of both Abhidhamma systematics and interpretations in terms of western philosophy/psychology, even though his designation of the *bhavaṅga-citta* as a "function of (!) consciousness" seems to indicate a less actualistic understanding of consciousness. ▪ The question of an object of *bhavaṅga-citta* is clarified at *Visuddhimagga* XIV.114 (here

in the context of dying): it is the same as the object of the preceding moment of *viññāna* (see also JAINI, "*Smṛti*", p. 58, n. 36). The footnotes in NYANAMOLI's translation (*Path of Purification*, p. 514f.) show that the interpretation of that passage is quite complex, but the dilemma of how unconsciousness goes together with the perception of an object is not addressed here. ▪ I have to apologize that I cannot provide any substantial philological research on this issue, but I hope to have pointed to some open questions. At least NĀRADA's not naming the object of *bhavaṅga-citta* seems to reflect some uncertainty as to the persuasiveness of that model. The question of an object, in turn, is prerequisite for clarifying the role of *saññā* in that state. To me as an outsider to Theravāda Abhidhamma *saññā* in connection with a *bhavaṅga-citta* would seem as artificial as an unconscious blind man embracing the leg of an elephant, but it is exactly at the limits of a model where the most rewarding subjects for research are often found. The approach of Aung and Mrs. Rhys-Davis, to take subliminal perception into account, is rightly rejected by Nārada, as the Abhidhamma officially allows only for conscious perception. Still, the invention of such models as the *bhavaṅga-citta* may point to a cautious broadening of the scholastic perception of mind.

[42] $\text{VinSg}_{t,D}$ 131b6-7 makes a distinction between disposition (*bsam pa*; **āśaya*?) and apperception (*'du shes*). As for apperception, there are four kinds: 1. Apperception with regard to that as being that [object there] (*de la der 'du shes pa*), 2. Apperception with regard to what is not that as being that [object there] (*de ma yin la der 'du shes pa*), 3. Apperception with regard to that as being not that [object there] (*de la de ma yin par 'du shes pa*), 4. Apperception with regard to what is not that as being not that [object there] (*de ma yin la de ma yin par 'du shes pa*). That is to say, one's apperception may either be accurate or inaccurate, also in cases where one assumes that the object is not something (e.g. the property of another). The ASBh does not mention that full tetralemma, but is in its conciseness still fully comprehensible. The VinSg explains disposition in the following way: "Here, the 'disposition' is the very wish to do (**kartukāmatā*) [based on] either an accurate apperception, or an inaccurate apperception (*de la bsam pa zhes bya ba ni 'du shes phyin ci log gam 'du shes phyin ci ma log pa'i byed 'dod pa nyid gang yin pa'o*)". • $\text{VinSg}_{t,D}$ 132a3f. (=$\text{VinSg}_{t,P}$ 138a8-b1), presents a detailed explanation of the apperception in the case of killing: "If the one who kills has, with regard to that living being [a.] the apperception that it is a living being, as well as [b.] the apperception with regard to the living being which one wants to kill that it is that one (*der*, Skt. **tad*), that is called an unmistaken apperception of that with regard to that" (*gal te gsod par byed pa de srog chags de la srog chags yin pa'i 'du shes kyang yod la / srog chags gang gsad par 'dod pa la der 'du shes pa la'ang yod pa de ni de la de'i 'du shes phyin ci ma log pa zhes bya'o //*). The VinSg explains the disposition (*bsam pa*), then, as follows: "He, based on that apperception, then makes up his mind (**cittam abhisaṃskaroti*), thinking 'I will kill it.' [That is] his disposition to kill (*de 'du shes de la brten te 'di gsad par bya'o snyam du sems mngon par 'du byed pa de ni de'i gsod pa'i bsam pa yin no //* , $\text{VinSg}_{t,D}$ 132a5, $\text{VinSg}_{t,P}$ 138b1-2)." • Skt. *tatsaṃjñayā* is rendered more explicitly as *de ltar 'du shes pas* at MaVyu 9238.

[43] Although I translate prayoga as "preparation" here, it must be understood that it is the preparation for the completion, which means that this "getting to work" comprises all the

steps up the completion of the *karmapatha*. The expression *prayogam ārabhate* is also used in the context of meditation. Because it includes the first steps of meditation, DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 473f., n. 19) paraphrases it as "gets down to practice". On the semantic range of *ā-/rabh*, see also CPD, s.v. *ārabhati*, MAYRHOFER, *Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, s.v. *rabhate* and *rabhaḥ*, SCHMITHAUSEN, *Sentience of Plants*, p. 10, n. 51, p. 19f, and p. 30, n. 168, and DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 383, n. 80. • RAHULA translates *prayoga* variously as "application" (*Compendium*, p. 84), "préparation" (*Compendium*, p. 87, ad AS 55,4ff.), or "moyen" (*Compendium*, p. 93, ad AS 59,8-10). In a footnote (*Compendium*, p. 84, n. 4), he explains that *prayoga* as the action proper, while the completion ("accomplissement", *ibid.*, n. 5) of the act is *niṣṭāgamana*. Cf. HEUPERS, "Foundation of Buddhist Ethics", p. 53, n. 20 and p. 56, n. 54.

44 'The preparation through others' refers to the case that one commissions another to do a bad deed. One could infer that this seems to include both, 1.) the preparation on the part of the commander, i.e. giving the order, and 2.) the preparation on the part of the recipient of the order, i.e. getting to work. It is, nonetheless, notable that this important issue is not explained in more detail.

45 The word *kriyā* ("deed, act") appears frequently in this section. In its general use, it is mostly synonymous with *karman*, but *karman* is the term for morally qualified action that leads to pleasant or unpleasant results even in non-Buddhist literature (see HALBFASS, *Karma und Wiedergeburt*, p. 29). Both terms can refer to the performance of rituals.

46 The term *kleśa*, which I translate as "defilement", actually carries the connotations of both "defilement" and "affliction" in Yogācāra literature. See SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 246f., n. 21 and HIRAKAWA, *Indian Buddhism*, p. 197f. See also AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 1 ("Befleckungen") and ZIMMERMANN, *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra*, p. 104, n. 58 ("defilements"). Cf. FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 79: "Laster." • The etymology of the Tibetan equivalent *nyon mongs* is not clear. According to SNELLGROVE (*Indo-Tibetan Buddhism*, p. 109), the artificial term *nyon* was invented based on *smyon* ("crazed"), and *mongs* based on *rmongs* ("obscured, stultified"). According to DUNG DKAR (*Shes bya rab gsal*, s.v. *nyon mongs*), the term *nyon mongs* was used because they obscure (*rmongs*) the mental continuum and bring forth all bad behaviour and bad thoughts. The person under their influence may behave in an inappropriate way (*des rang rgyud ldan gyi gang zag sems rgyud rmongs par byed pa dang / lus ngag yid gsum gyi nyes spyod bsam ngan skye 'phel byed pa'i dbang gis ming de ltar btags shing / de yod mkhan gyi gang zag des bya spyod ma rungs par byed thub pa ste /...*). Nonetheless, an etymology based on *smyon* and *rmongs* may well be a later interpretation. A similar issue is the term *bsod nams* (for *puṇya*), which the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* claims to be based on *bsod* (or even *gsos*) and *bsnams* (*gzhan la phan zhing bsod pas gsos zhing bsnams pa'i ming ste bsod nams su btags*; ISHIKAWA, sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa, p. 94).

47 On the "roots of the unwholesome [actions]" (greed, hatred, and delusion), see MN, no. 9 (*Sammādiṭṭhisutta*): *katamañ cāvuso akusalamūlaṃ / lobho akusalamūlaṃ doso akusalamūlaṃ moho akusalamūlaṃ*. The "roots of the wholesome [actions]" are their very opposites, i.e. *alobha*, *adoṣa*, and *amoha*. The respective passages from the

Sammādiṭṭhisutta are translated in THANISSARO BHIKKHU, *Wings to Awakening*, p. 34f. See also the *Kamalasutta* (AN, no. 65): *lobhena abhibhūto pariyādinnacitto pāṇampi hanti adinnampi ādiyati / paradārampi gacchati musāpi bhaṇati* .... THANISSARO BHIKKHU, *op.cit.*, p. 33f. The *akuśalamūlāni* are listed at AKBh 291,8 (*lobho 'kuśalamūlaṃ dveṣo moho 'kuśalamūlam*), the *kuśalamūlāni* (*alobha, adveṣa, amoha*) at AKBh 54,22. • My translation of *akuśalamūlāni* as "roots of the unwholesome [actions]" follows AHN (*Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 331): "Wurzel unheilsamer [Handlungen]". The respective explanations at $\mathrm{VinSg_{t,D}}$ *zhi* 123a4 state that they, among others, "motivate bad behaviour" (*nyes par spyod pa kun nas slong bar byed*, AHN, *op.cit.*, p. 135). See also MUROJI, *Pratītyasamutpādavyākhyā*, p. 139. Still, the *akusalamūlas* (including the inability to feel shame and guilt) are also considered the *original* unwholesome factors, in so far as they are unwholesome by their very nature (*svabhāvatas*, AKBh 202,21), while any mental factor associated with them is considered unwholesome by association (*saṃprayogatas*, AKBh 202,22), even if those mental factors do not lead to actions. See also AS-Bu-ston, fol. 116a3, as well as NYANATILOKA, *Buddhist Dictionary*, s.v. *mūla*, for the position of Theravāda Abhidhamma. They seem to be more fundamental than other mental factors–in Abhidharma/Abhidhamma at least, while the sutta sources adduced by NYANATILOKA are much less explicit. I would therefore prefer a translation similar to LA VALLÉE POUSSIN's "racines de mal" (*Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 35). Unfortunately, "roots of what is unwholesome" would be awkward English. In the context of meditation, there is a set of four "roots of the wholesome [factors]" (see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 474, n. 21), which are altogether different from the *kuśalamūlāni* in the context of *karman*. • I translate the three roots rather literally as "passion" (*rāga*), "hatred" (*dveṣa*) and "delusion" (*moha*). In Buddhist doctrine, nonetheless, those "roots" can also be present in mental states where it would not be justified to speak of, e.g., "hatred", and where the presence of *dveṣa* indicates a less strongly felt dislike. Cf. DELHEY, *Samāhitā Bhūmiḥ*: "Zuneigung, Abneigung, Fehlorientiertheit."

48 DPANG LO's comment, "The defilements are taught in the text itself" (*nyon mongs pa ni gzhung nyid du 'chad do //*, AS-dPang-lo, fol. 220b5), seems to refer to the first part of the *samudayasatya* section in the AS, where the defilements are explained.

49 $\mathrm{ASVy_{t,G}}$ 300b4 has a fourfold *daṇḍa* with a huge gap after *yongs su rdzogs pa'o*, as if indicating a chapter ending.

50 The phrasing at $\mathrm{VinSg_{t,D}}$ 132a2 is "through the preparation [the end comes about] at that very time, or after (*'og tu* = *ūrdhvam*?) that time (*sbyor bas dus de nyid kyi tshe'am dus de'i 'og tu*)."

51 Here, the semantic function of the word *tatra* is to mark the beginning of the detailed explanations on the preceding list, i.e. "here" in the sense of "in this context". Sanskrit MSS cannot express that function graphically, while one can simply start a new paragraph in a modern typeset edition. Skt. *tatra* therefore often stands where "here" in the beginning of a paragraph in the English translation would be misplaced and irritating (see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 467, n. 2). Still as long as that is not the case and "here" fits in well with the flow of the English text, I prefer to translate it and I do so in

order to distinguish those paragraphs where the original author found it necessary to mark a caesura from those where he did not.

[52] RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 83, n. 8) rightly points to the distinction between killing (*prāṇātipāta*) and the *pārājika* offence of "depriving a human being of his life" (*manussaviggahaṃ jīvitā voropeyya*, Vin i.97, etc.), i.e. murder. My own rendering, "killing", is only partly accurate, as it can also mean accidental killing. I am indebted to Iain SINCLAIR for bringing this point to my attention. One of the problems in finding an accurate equivalent for *prāṇātipāta* is that in Europe, intentionally killing an animal was basically not considered a sin. Another alternative would be "slaughter", but this implies "violent and bloody means of killing" (*Random House Unabridged Dictionary*, s.v.). I therefore opt for the too broad term rather than the too narrow one. On the etymology and connotations of *prāṇātipāta* and *prāṇin*, see SCHMITHAUSEN, *Sentience of Plants*, p. 2, n. 2 and p. 19, and id. *Buddhism and Nature*, p. 34, n. 182. • SCHMITHAUSEN (*Buddhism and Nature*, p. 42) proposes that the prohibition of killing may have been formulated for monks first, as it is hardly feasible for laypeople in everyday life. Still, it stands out as the first of these ten points of a layman's ethics. Note that typical Mahāyāna doctrines are absent here–like the Bodhisattva's killing out of compassion (on which see SCHMITHAUSEN, "Bodhisattva-Ethik", p. 27f., SNELLGROVE, *Indo-Tibetan Buddhism*, p. 66, or TATZ, *Skill in Means*, p. 73f.). That *prāṇātipāta* is considered a major misdeed up to the present day can be seen in a standard debate of Tibetan monastic education, which addresses the question whether killing is the gravest of the ten unwholesome deeds, or holding wrong views. The answer is clearly wrong views, for a denial of *karman* is believed to be the basis of all other vices.

[53] RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 84, n. 3) calls this the *vadhakacitta* ("pensée violente, l'intention de tuer"). See the apocalyptic description of the end of a world system in the YBh 33,15-16 (*Manobhūmi*): *teṣāṃ anyonyaṃ sattvaṃ dṛṣṭvā tīvram vadhakacitta* (YBh_c 286a3: 殺害之心) *pratyupasthitaṃ bhavati*. That sentence is (with some variations) also found in the AKBh. Here, *vyāpāda* seems to indicate a fundamental aggressive, homicidal mood, and the *vadhakacitta* its concretion upon seeing another living being (*teṣāṃ vyāpāda utkarṣaṃ gato 'nyonyaṃ sattvaṃ dṛṣṭvā tīvram ādhātacittaṃ vadhakacittaṃ ca pratyupasthitaṃ bhavati* /, AKBh 188,2f.). Such a usage of *vyāpāda* is slightly different from the explanation in the ASBh passage under research, where it is a clear and rational decision to kill a certain living being. Therefore it becomes questionable whether we can follow RAHULA and simply equate *vadhābhiprāya* with *vadhakacitta*. It is more likely that *vadhakacitta* leads to instinctive slaughter (i.e., in the case of humans, homicide) and *vadhābhiprāya* to premeditated killing (i.e., in the case of humans, murder).

[54] *Praharaṇa* can mean "striking" as well as the respective instrument, i.e. a weapon. Cf. $ASBh_{t,P}$ "a weapon and so on" (*mtshon cha la sogs pa'o*, = $ASVy_{t,P}$ 240a4), $ASVy_c$ 727b26: "a sword, a cane, and so on (如刀杖等). Neither $ASBh_t$ nor $ASVy_c$ render the instrumental.

[55] The reconstruction *vadhāya* takes Chinese 爲...故 ("for the sake of ...") into account,

which can stand for an original dative (cf. $ASBh_{t,P}$ *bsams pa'i*).

[56] Cf. the explanations in AKBh 244,12-21 (AKVy 406,10-13).

[57] A TI SHA (*Mi dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam bstan pa*, p. 490) gives more explanations on persons not to be gone to: Those who are protected by the banner of the Dharma (*chos kyi rgyal mtshan* [...] *gyis bsrungs pa*), by their kind (or caste, *rigs kyis bsrungs pa*), by the king (*rgyal pos bsrungs pa*), prostitutes who are "taken by another" (*gzhan gyis blangs pa'i smad 'tshong ma*, ?), relatives (*gnyen 'brel can*) and animals (*byol song*). I cannot resolve the obscure phrase "prostitutes who are taken by another." SHERBURNE proposes the translation "procured by another." BASHAM (*The Wonder that was India*, p. 185) claims that in ancient India "the prostitute was protected and supervised by the state." But the easiest explanation of "taken by another" is that of a steadily employed courtesan or concubine (cf. BASHAM, *op.cit.*, p. 186), in which case A TI SHA's text would clearly approve of intercourse with prostitutes who are not taken by another. The phrasing "women not appropriated by another" (*aparigrhīta*) seems to refer to prostitutes. See SCHMITHAUSEN, "Bodhisattva-Ethik", p. 45. The interpretations of NYANAPONIKA (*Wurzeln von Gut und Böse*, p. 44) and SGAM PO SPYAN SNGA (*sNgon 'gro*, p. 67) explicitly forbid intercourse with prostitutes, but this may be a fairly recent development. • Nuns are considered "protected by the king". See AS-Thar-lo, p. 355,6-7: "If you commit adultery (*g.yems*?) with a nun, you commit adultery against (?) the sovereign of that country. Because he has made it unacceptable" (*dge slong ma la g.yems na yul de'i bdag po la g.yems par 'gyur te / des mi bzod par byas pa'i phyir ro //*). • To understand the range of the term "protected" here, also Yājñavalkya's *Dharmaśāstra* should be taken into account which prescribes that a woman shall be protected by her father, her husband, her sons or her relatives, but "never shall a woman be dependent upon herself." See GLASENAPP, *Indische Geisteswelt*, vol. I, p. 161f. Cf. N.R. REAT ("Historical Buddha", p. 50) who neglects that difference between men and women in the context of sexual morals: "Presumably, women too should have sexual dealings only with men who support themselves, assuming in either case, of course, that no violence or dishonesty is involved."

[58] AS-Bu-ston, p. 517,4: "mouth and anus" (*kha dang bshang lam*). • *dDu ma la 'jug pa'i 'grel bshad*, 87b: "As for 'going to the wrong limb': the limb for sexual intercourse is the female organ, so the wrong limb is the mouth or the anus. ['Going to the wrong limb' means] doing it there". (*yan lag ma yin par 'gro ba ni 'khrig pa'i yan lag ni bud med kyi dbang po yin la / yan lag ma yin pa ni kha dang bshang lam ste / der spyod pa'o //*). Same doctrine in SGAM PO PA (*Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 56). See also the discussion of *pumān*, below.

[59] AS-Bu-ston, p. 517,4-5: "[where there is] light, [near a] Stūpa or temple, before a Lama or many living beings, or when there is a harmful, uneven or hard ground at that place" (*yul min pa snang ba dang / mchod rten dang gtsug lag khang dang / bla ma / skye bo mang po mngon sum dang / yul de la gnod pa'i sa 'bar bur dang sra ba sogs so //*). I am not sure whether my interpretation of the final three items is correct. • SGAM PO PA (*Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 56): "Not the [right] place means doing it close to a Bla ma, in a temple, near a Stūpa, or at a place where many [people] have come together" (*yul*

ma yin pa ni / bla ma'i nye 'khor ram / gtsug lag khang ngam / mchod rten gyi drung ngam / mang po 'dus pa'i sar spyad pa'o //).

[60] AS-Bu-ston, p. 517,5-6: "Not the [right] time [means when] she is pregnant, [when the infant] drinks mother's milk, when the menstruation emits, when a disease that makes desirous behaviour inappropriate has arisen, when observing the *upavāsa* [restraints], and more than five times in one night (*dus min sbrum ma dang / nu zho 'thung ba dang / zla mtshan 'dzag pa dang / 'dod pa spyad mi rung ba'i nad byung ba dang / bsnyen gnas la gnas pa dang / mtshan gcig lan lnga las lhag pa'o //*). • AKBh 244,16-17: "What, then, is not the [right] time? When he goes to [her] when she is pregnant, nursing [a child], or when she is under a promise (*saniyamā*) [to celibacy]. Some say 'when she is under a promise of permission by her husband.'" (*kaḥ punaḥ akālaḥ / garbhiṇīṃ vā gacchati pāyayantīṃ vā saniyamāṃ vā / yadi bharturanujñayā saniyamā bhavatīty eke*). The latter promise is unfortunately not explained in the AKVy. • SGAM PO PA (*Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 56): "Not the [right] time [means] doing it at the time of observing the *poṣadha*, when she is pregnant, when [an infant] drinks milk, or when there is light (cf. GUENTHER, *Jewel Ornament*, p. 76: 'in daylight')." (*dus ma yin pa ni / gso sbyong la gnas pa'i dus sam / sbrum ma'am / nu zho 'thung ba'am / snang ba yod pa'i dus su spyad pa'o //*). For *poṣadha*, the eight fasting restraints which include celibacy, see NYANATILOKA (*Buddhist Dictionary*, s.v *uposatha*) and ASBh 68,19-20. SGAM PO PA does not make it clear whether it is the wife or the husband who is observing the *poṣadha* in this context.

[61] AS-Bu-ston, p. 517,6: "more than five times in one night". Bu ston has included this among the explanations on "not the [right] time" (see above). • YBh$_c$ 631b20-21: 過量而行名爲非量是中量者極至於五此外一切皆名過量. To the same effect also SGAM PO PA (*Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 56) "Excessive [means] doing it more than five times" (*tshod ma yin pa ni / grangs ma lnga las lhag par spyod pa'o /*).

[62] The YBh explains this as "what does not conform to the usual manners" (YBh$_c$ 631b21-22: 不依世禮名非理), and gives some examples (YBh$_c$ 631b22-25). • The rendering *rigs ma yin pa* (for Skt. *ayuktaṃ*) in ASBh$_t$ could be misunderstood as "someone who is not of one's own caste" . Cf. SGAM PO PA (*Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 56): *rigs pa ma yin pa.*

[63] HARVEY (*Buddhist Ethics*, p. 421f) deals with the treatment of homosexual intercourse by "the Indian commentators", which seems to refer primarily to Abhidharma literature. In HARVEY's view, it is only the author of "the commentary on the *Abhidharma-samuccaya*" exclusively who explicitly forbids homosexual acts. As for the reason, HARVEY (loc. cit.) assumes that "this may simply be due to an oversight, in which the texts concentrate on the most common ways of breaking the third precept, rather than a positive acceptance of homosexual acts." He sees SGAM PO PA's explicit prohibition of homosexual acts as to stand in opposition to Indian usage in some way: "In Tibet though, sGam-po-pa [...] includes homosexuality in his discussion of the third precept [...]. After discussing various forms of sexual misconduct of a man with a woman, in a way which seems partially derived from the *Abhidharma-kośa-bhāṣya*–which omits reference to homosexual acts [...]–he adds 'It also means to have intercourse with a male or in a

paṇḍaka's mouth or anus[...]." HARVEY, op. cit., p. 422. He is nonetheless aware of the fact that that this is one of the key ethical issues of contemporary Buddhism. In this discourse, the current DALAI LAMA stated that "Sexual misconduct is for men and women consists of oral and anal sex .... Even with your wife, using one's mouth or other hole is sexual misconduct." HARVEY, op. cit., p. 432. • Against HARVEY, with whom I share the appreciation both for the Buddhist tradition and for the freedom for sexual self-determination, I would like to demonstrate that the statements of SGAM PO PA and the DALAI LAMA are based on the Indian tradition. It should be noted that the DALAI LAMA holds a more differentiated view on the issue than expressed in the above quotation. See HARVEY, *op. cit.*, p. 432f. • AKBh: Although the discussion of sexual misconduct in the AKBh does not contain an explicit prohibition of homosexuality, I think it's implication can be demonstrated by the following example: The AKBh (again, clearly focussing on male sexuality) forbids sexual intercourse with one's mother or daughter (*mātaraṃ duhitaraṃ*), but makes no mention of one's father or son (*agamyāṃ gacchati paraparigṛhītāṃ vā mātaraṃ duhitaraṃ vā mātṛpitṛsaṃvandhinīṃ vā* /, AKBh 244,13f). Nonetheless, judging from the whole framework of sexual morals presented here, the permission of male homosexual incest be can be positively excluded–which is surely the reason that Vasubandhu does not mention it explicitly. Furthermore, the explicit mention of male homosexuality becomes redundant by the prohibition of oral and anal intercourse ("even with one's own wife", *anaṅge vā gacchati svam api bhāryām apāne mukhe vā*, AKBh 244,14f., see also HARVEY, *Buddhist Ethics*, p. 433), which is found in a broad range of Buddhist literature (see LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 157, nn. 1, 3). See also DELANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 495) for a discussion of the term *putradāra*. • *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 76,4f. allows vaginal intercourse exclusively (*evaṃ svastrīṣv apy ayonimārgeṇa gacchataḥ*). BENDALL's translation of *ayonimārgeṇa* (*Compendium of Buddhistic Teachings*, p. 80) is unsatisfying: "So too of the man who uses his wife against kind". • A TI SHA (*Mi dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam bstan pa*, p. 490) explains that there are four kinds of sexual misconduct: a.) wrong place, b.) wrong time, c.) wrong limb, d.) someone not to be gone to (*'gro bar bya ba ma yin pa*). There is no explicit mention of homosexuality, but the prohibition of oral and anal intercourse. The passage concludes with the sentence: "So [does one commit] sexual misconduct even adhering to one's own wife". (*de ltar rang gi chung ma la'ang brten nas 'dod pas log par g.yem par 'gyur ro* //. The words *la'ang brten* are tentatively construed based on SHERBURNE's edition, *la'ang bsten*, and the ACIP electronic text TD3859 (*la brten*). On *bsten* vs. *brten*, see below.). The sentence appears to be misplaced, following after d.) and not c.). It was possibly intended as kind of summary. • SGAM PO PA (*Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 56) makes a threefold distinction between a.) sexual misconduct with a woman who is protected by the Dharma, b.) with a woman who is protected by a lord (or owner, bdag po, i.e. the king or a husband), and c.) with one's own wife. He mentions the five aspects (wrong limb, wrong place, wrong time, excessive, and inappropriate) only under the last point ("even if she is one's own wife", *rang gi chung ma yin yang, ibid.*). After this pattern, SGAM PO PA adds a short sentence, saying: "Or else, doing it in the mouth or anus of a man or transvestite (*ma ning*)" (*yang na pho'am ma ning gi kha'am bshang lam du spyad pa'o* /, *ibid.*). It seems that SGAM PO PA wanted to make something clear that is actually implied in "wrong limb". He does not mention any other technique of homosexual or transsexual

intercourse. • Although the *dDu ma la 'jug pa'i 'grel bshad*, 87b (see above) clearly states that the vagina is the only permitted organ for sexual intercourse, I found it necessary to plead for an implicit interpretation of those texts that are not so straightforward. An argument for implicit interpretation is actually found in a quotation from the **Vairocanatantra* in A TI SHA's *Las rnam par 'byed pa*, p. 508: "One has to turn away from sexual misconduct. If one does not generate desire towards a wife that is protected by another, by her family (or caste, *rigs*) or by a sign (*mtshan ma*), or by the Dharma, what need to mention doing it at the wrong limb or joining two [sexual] organs?" (*'dod pas log par g.yem pa las ldog par bya ste / des gzhan gyis yongs su bzung ba'i chung ma dang/ rigs dang/ mtshan ma dang/ chos kyis bsrungs pa rnams la chags pa bskyed par yang mi bya na/ yan lag ma yin par spyod pa dang / dbang po gnyis sprod pa lta ci smos/*). Although the quotation partly aims at demonstrating that the discipline of the Bodhisattva is even stricter than that of a Śrāvaka, here it simply demonstrates that physical misdeeds (here: "doing it at the wrong limb" and so on) are automatically ruled out by a rejection of their mental prerequisites (here: "if one does not generate desire towards ..."). The same argument is applied to stealing, and so on. • There is still another reason why I think it is not fair to blame the condemnation of homosexuality on SGAM PO PA: As far as the sexually divergent (*za ma dang ma ning*, see also below) are concerned, SGAM PO PA (*Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 83, see also GUENTHER, *Jewel Ornament*, p. 107) is completely traditional in that they cannot receive any of the *prātimokṣa* vows. But he also upholds the Mahāyāna tradition, according to which they can very well receive the Bodhisattva vows! This is not the former householder SGAM PO PA's personal inclination, but simply the tradition he transmits. And indeed in that tradition, the Mahāyāna layer seems more advanced (urban?) than the *prātimokṣa*.

[64] The exact meaning of *napuṃsaka* (lit. "not a male") is difficult to determine. BÖHTLINGK and ROTH (*Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, s.v.) render it as "neither man nor woman, hermaphrodite, eunuch". As for the physical details, the understanding of the ASBh author were probably as broad (or vague?) as BÖHTLINGK and ROTH's definition. Males are mentioned separately, so *napuṃsaka* seems not to apply to homosexual men here. • In Jainism, the term *napuṃsaka* is primarily applied to mythical beings. HALBFASS, *Karma und Wiedergeburt*, p. 80f. • According to BÖHTLINGK and ROTH (*Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*) the noun *napuṃsaka* (s.v.), when it refers to a living being, can stand in both neuter or masculine gender. The entries in MAYRHOFER, *Wörterbuch des Altindischen* (s.v. *napuṃsaka*) and id. *Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* (s.v. *napuṃsaka*) do not address this issue seriously. • See also the discussion on the asexuals and eunuchs below (AS 57,13-16).

[65] BU STON: "As for lying: [It occurs when] someone who wishes to twist his apprehension and says [the lie] to another in a way that [the other] understands [the false information]. [It is as follows: One claims] that one has not seen what one has seen, and so on. [There are] eight [combinations] (*rdzun ni / 'du shes bsgyur te smra 'dod kyis gzhan la go bar smra ba ste / mthong ba la ma mthong sogs brgyad do //*, AS-Bu-ston, p. 517,7). I take the expression "twist one's apprehension" (*'du shes bsgyur*) to mean that one who has perceived something conceptually (for example: "it is blue") falsifies that concept ("it is red"). • BU STON emphasizes the reception, the understanding of what is

said on the part of the other. He mentions the case when the words of the lie are not understood by the recipient. In that case, he says, it has to be considered idle prattle. Lit. "When [the recipient] does not understand it, it is idle prattle." (*ma go na / ngag khyal yin* [...], *ibid.*). To the same effect, AS-'Jam-dbyangs, p. 172,3 (*pha rol pos ma go na ni brdzun du mi 'gyur zhing ngag 'khyal tsam du 'gyur ro //*). • BU STON then addresses the issue of misleading gestures ("making signs with the body", *lus kyi brda byed pa*, *ibid.*). Also those are counted as lying, but BU STON does not explain why bodily expressions can be verbal *karman*. It is further considered lying when one does not duly make one's confessions but remains silent during the confession ceremony, or (?) when silently accepting another's praise (*lus ngag gnyis kas mi byed kyang / gso sbyong gi tshe dag pa dris na ci yang mi smra ba gzhan gyis yon tan brjod cing bsnyen bkur bstabs pa dang du len pa sogs so //*, AS-Bu-ston, p. 518,1). • Also 'JAM DBYANGS BLO GROS stresses the point that the lie has to be understood by the other. He quotes a verse, saying "The meaning (*ngag don*) of the words of the lie, having twisted one's apperception to something else, is clearly (*mngon par*) understood" (*brdzun tshig 'du shes gzhan bsgyur pa'i / ngag [...] don mngon par go ba'o /*, AS-'Jam-dbyangs, p. 172,2). After *ngag*, the following explanation is inserted in a smaller type: "Because of the thought which is that of Devadatta, Dānadatta [understands the meaning (*don*) clearly]." (*lha sbyin gyi yin pa'i bsam pas mchod sbyin gyi[s] /*, *ibid.*).

66 YBh 175,2-3 (ed. AYMORÉ): *tribhir vyavahārair anubhūtaṃ yat taj jñātam dṛṣṭenānubhūtaṃ drsta(m) eva*. AYMORÉ, *Karma*, p. 94: "Das, was durch die drei ‹übrigen› Erkenntnisformen erfahren worden ist, ist 'Erkanntes'. Was durch 'Sehen' erfahren worden ist, das ist eben 'Gesehenes'."

67 DPANG LO notices a difference to the *VinSg*: "In the VinSg, the object of lying, too, is said to be a sentient being" (*bsdu bar ni brdzun gyi'ang gzhi sems can du gsungs so //*, AS-dPang-lo, fol. 220b4-5). It is not clear to me whether "sentient being" here refers to the recipient of the message, i.e. the person lied to, or rather to a person lied about. In the latter case the distinction between lying and slander would at times be difficult. The VinSg passage I found ($VinSg_{t,D}$ *zhi* 131b3), anyhow, does not mention sentient beings but identifies the object (*gzhi*) as "what has been seen, heard, and distinguished (*bye brag byed pa*)", which perfectly accords with the AS and the YBh.

68 YBh 175,1 (ed. AYMORÉ): *pṛthag vaṇikśreṇyaḥ pariṣad*. AYMORÉ, *Karma*, p. 96: "Die einzelnen Kaufmannsgilden bilden eine Versammlung." The YBh passage does not mention an opponent. • $ASBh_t$: "the assembly (/ entourage) and the opponent" (*'khor dang phyir rgol ba*). • $ASVy_c$ 727c5-6: "The completion (lit. "ultimate", 究竟) is the comprehension (/ understanding) [on the part of] those assembled (時衆) and the opponent (對言者)" (究竟者。謂時衆及對言者領解; $ASVy_j$ 149: 究竟とは、謂く、時衆と及び對言者との領解なり).

69 The reconstruction *anyathāsaṃjñino* (Tib. *gzhan du 'du shes la*) is parallel to ASBh 63,20 *tatsaṃjñino* (Tib. *der 'du shes shing*). See also GOKHALE, "Emendation". • Cf. YBh 175,5-6 (ed. AYMORÉ): *vinidhāya samjñā[ṃ] rucim dṛṣṭim bhāṣaṇāt*. AYMORÉ, *Karma*, p. 95: "weil er spricht, indem er sein ‹tatsächliches› Wissen, seine Meinung und

Ansicht ‹bezüglich der Angelegenheit› beiseitesetzt". Note that *saṃjñāṃ* is missing in BHATTACHARYA's edition. Cf. also YBh 175,7 (ed. AYMORÉ): *saṃjñāvi[saṃ]vādanatas*. AYMORÉ, *Karma*, p. 95: "aufgrund der Nichtübereinstimmung ‹seiner Zeugnisablegung› mit seinem ‹tatsächlichen› Wissen ‹von der Angelegenheit›". • The Japanese translation differs from the Skt., and even from the Chinese: "The disposition (lit. "mental pleasure", 意樂) is a conception that differs [from what is based on seeing, and so on], and desiring to relate [that] different [conception]" (意樂とは、謂く、[見等に於けると]別異なる想と、[此の]別異[なる想]を說んと欲するなり, ASVy$_j$ 149,20-150,1). Cf. ASVy$_c$ 727c5: 意樂者。謂別異想欲別異說.

[70] The "object" (*vastu*) in the case of lying was the thing spoken *about* (something seen, heard, etc.) and not the person harmed by the lie. I think this applies to slander, too. Someone is the object of slander as soon as something slanderous is said *about* him. BU STON, in contrast, claims that the words of divisive speech have to be unmistakenly clear to *both* target persons (*phra ma ni / dbye 'dod kyis pha rol po gnyis la ma nor bar tshig go bar smra ba* ..., AS-Bu-ston, p. 518,1). Note that the Tibetan translation of the ASBh uses the particle *dag* (*sems can 'dum pa dang / mi 'dum pa dag*, same in ASVy$_{t,P}$ 240b1), which often stands for the dual, while the Sanskrit original is clearly plural (*samagravyagrāḥ sattvāḥ*). • From AS-'Jam-dbyangs, p. 172,5, it appears that *the faults of* both targets have to be told to both of them: "Having told the faults of the other in a way that [each of them] is not mistaken and understands it" (*phan tshun gyi skyon ma nor zhing go bar smras pa*).

[71] RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 83) translates *paiśunya* as "médisance" (disparagement, backbiting); Boin-Webb (ASAṄGA, *Compendium*, p. 113): "slander". • If one were to follow the ASBh explanations strictly, the equivalent "divisive speech" would be more accurate (see, e.g., THANISSARO BHIKKHU, *Wings to Awakening*, p. 177, or TSONG KHA PA, *Stages of the Path*, vol. 1, p. 223), but in terms of style it is rather Translationese. In terms of semantics, "divisive speech" is much more technical and non-moralistic than *paiśunya* in common usage, where it has connotations of "wicked" and "betraying" (see MAYRHOFER, *Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, s.v. *piśunaḥ*), i.e. it has a stronger emotional impact, and a negative one. ▪ In legal terms, "slander" is the only the oral form of defamation, and although I assume that written defamation, i.e. libel, would be considered *paiśunya* by contemporary Buddhists, the list of the ten unwholesome actions stems from a predominantly oral epoch. BU STON only mentions "saying" (*smra*) divisive words (*tshig*), but as he mentions "reading" in the context of harsh words, and even gestures in the context of lying, we can safely assume that "slander" can be done not only through the spoken word. See AS-Bu-ston, pp. 517,7-518,2. ▪ Buddhist *paiśunya* also applies when the exposed shortcomings *de facto* exist, which equals the handling of slander/defamation in the contemporary jurisdiction of many countries. BU STON explicitly states: "When one says the truth, it is this (i.e. slander). When one tells a lie, it is both (i.e. lying and slander)." (*bden tshig smras na / 'dir 'gyur / rdzun tshig smras na / gnyis kar 'gyur ro //*, AS-Bu-ston, p. 518,2). To the same effect, AS-'Jam-dbyangs, p. 172,5f. (*de'ang bden par smras na phra ma kho na yin la / brdzun smras na brdzun dang phra ma gnyis kar 'gyur ro /*), and TSONG KHA PA, *Stages of the Path*, vol. 1, p. 223.

[72] See YBh 175,10-11 (ed. AYMORÉ): *samagrāṇāṃ bhettā bhavati viprītisaṃjananatayā / bhinnānām cānupradātā / prītisaṃbhavavilomanatayā /*. AYMORÉ, *Karma*, p. 96: "'Er ist ein Spaltender der Einträchtigen' dadurch, daß er eine feindselige Stimmung erzeugt, 'und ein Aufhetzer der ‹schon› Gespaltenen', weil er der Entstehung einer freundschaftlichen Stimmung entgegenwirkt", and YBh 175,12 (ed. AYMORÉ): *vyagrārāmo bhavati* (Tib. *mi 'dum par dga' ba yin*); AYMORÉ, loc. cit.: "Jemand, der Vergnügen am Trennen hat".

[73] See YBh 176,2 (ed. AYMORÉ): *bhedābhiprāyatā*. AYMORÉ, *Karma*, p. 96: "die Tatsache, daß er jemand ist, der die Spaltung beabsichtigt."

[74] From the Abhidharma point of view, *pāruṣya* implies more than just harshness, for one can be harsh (i.e. brisk) without being insulting–which is the tone of the even Buddha's speech in many *suttas*. The equivalent "abusive speech" (THANISSARO BHIKKHU, *Wings to Awakening*, p. 177) is thus technically correct, but at the expense of losing the metaphor (*pāruṣya*=rough, harsh). The ambivalence seems to exist in Sanskrit, too. The only evidence I can provide, anyhow, comes from the 19th-century author RDZA DPAL SPRUL (*Kun bzang bla ma'i zhal lung*, p. 169). He writes: "Even if the words are not harsh, making the other unhappy by means of soft [words] still falls under 'harsh words'" (*tshig rtsub po min kyang 'jam po'i sgo nas pha rol po yid mi bde bar byed pa yang tshig rtsub tu 'dus*). See also DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 483, n. 45. • BU STON defines harsh words as saying unpleasant things to another in a way that he unmistakenly understands it, but "in the **Viniścayasaṃgrahaṇī* (*bsdu ba*) it is taught that even when one reads [harsh words] or has said [them] in seclusion they are this (i.e. harsh words)." (*ngag rtsub ni / mi snyan pa smra 'dod kyis pha rol pa la ma nor bar zhes sbyar te / bsdu bar / klog gam dben par smras kyang 'dir 'gyur bar bshad do //*, AS-Bu-ston, p. 518,2. Grammatically, one would expect either *bklags sam dben par smras* or *klog gam dben par smra*. See also ASBh 64,3-4, where Skt. *bhāṣaṇam* is translated as *smras pa*.). That, again, conflicts with BU STON's emphasis on the recipient, which may stem from the AKBh. TSONG KHA PA (*Lam rim che ba*, p. 170, see also id., *Stages of the Path*, p. 223) seems to be of the same opinion, i.e. that the comprehension on the part of the other is necessary to make it a full *karmapatha*: "In the VinSg (VinSg$_{t,P}$ *zi* 139a4), it is stated that 'the completion is having said the harsh words to him.', [and] the meaning of what has been said in that manner has to be understood by the object (i.e. the person) to whom it was spoken. [That] has been explained in the AKBh." (*bsdu ba las mtha' ni de la ngag rtsub po smras pa'o // zhes gsungs pa'i don gang la smras pa'i yul des go ba dgos par mdzod 'grel las bshad do //*. Slightly atypical construction. At first sight one would expect "Regarding the meaning [of that VinSg statement]...). • The ordinary Abhidharma terms for "harsh words" are either *paruṣa* (which is the same as the adjective, "rough", but also "piercing, pointed, harsh"), or its *vṛddhi* derivative *pāruṣya*. YOKOYAMA and HIROSAWA (YBh-Index-CST, s.v. 語 麁惡, 麁語, 麁惡語 etc.) and HIRAKAWA (AKBh-Index-Skt) list only *paruṣa*, *pāruṣya*, and several related words, like *pāruṣyaka* (AKBh) or *pāruṣika* (YBh). *Pāruṣaka* (BHSD, s.v.) seems to be a resanskritization of Pāli *phārusaka*, and not derived from a Sanskrit word **pāruṣa* (although such a word would be possible, in analogy to *mānuṣa* which derives from *mānuṣya*). I therefore follow TATIA's emendation of the MS reading

"pāruṣasya" to *"pāruṣyasya"*.

[75] Skt. *āghāta* here in the sense of "anger". See BHSD (s.v.). According to BÖHTLINGK, ROTH (*Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, s.v., 2), *āghāta* can mean both, striking and injury, and it appears in compounds with either that which causes the strike or with that which receives the strike. The rather cryptic Tibetan translation "a very tormenting mind" (*kun nas mnar sems*, same equivalent in $ASVy_{t,P}$ 240b2) could indicate as an intention to harm another. Cf. EDGERTON (BHSD, *loc.cit.*): "Tib. *kun nas mnar sems pa*, inaccurately, *very tormented spirit*". As far as *mnar* is concerned, EDGERTON's interpretation follows JÄSCHKE (*Tibetan-English*, s.v. *mnar ba*), who only mentions "to suffer, to be tormented". Nonetheless, the transitive sense is attested by ROERICH (*Tibetan-Russian-English*, s.v.), "1. to suffer, to be tormented, [...], 2. to torment [...] 3. to oppress". According to KRANG DBYI SUN, ed., (*Tshig mdzod chen mo*), *mnar ba* (s.v.) is a *tha mi dad pa* ("intransitive") verb. Nonetheless, the same entry presents the *tha dad pa* ("transitive") verbs *'tshe ba* (to harm), and *gzir ba* (to be affected, to suffer) as synonyms. See also *ibid.*, s.v. *mnar sems*: *'tshe ba'i sems sam khro sems* ("A mind to harm, or an angry mind"). The CPD basically translates *āghāta* as "hatred, anger", etc., without putting much emphasis on the aspect of subjective suffering. Nonetheless, according to the CPD *āghātita* can mean both, "struck, beaten", as well as "afflicted (with anger), befallen (by anger)", and *āghātitamana* "whose heart is vexed." The latter resembles the English expression "irritated" (for "angry"), or German "Aufgebrachtheit", which is how JACOBI (*Triṃśikāvijñapti*, p. 35) chose to translate the term at TrBh 28,16f. (*pratighaḥ satveṣv āghātaḥ satveṣu rūkṣacittatā*). I find that more convincing than CONE's (*Dictionary of Pāli*, s.v. *āghāteti*) equivalent "inspired with hatred or ill-will" for *āghātita*. See also the definition of anger at $VinSg_{t,D}$ 109a7: *khong khro ba gang zhe na / sems kyi kun nas mnar sems pa gang yin pa'o //*, (AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 177, and n. 51). • Similar to the *āghātanimitta* are the expressions *āghātavastu*, "object of anger" (AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 219, ns. 196, 198, "Anlässe für Haßgefühl") or *āghātakāraṇa*, "cause/circumstance for anger" (CPD, s.v.). On *nimitta*, see also DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 473, n. 17. • It seems that $ASVy_t$ consistently translates ... *rgyur gyur pa*, while $ASBh_t$ has both, *rgyur* and *gzhir*. $ASBh_{t,P}$ 57b8-58a1: *kun nas mnar sems kyi gzhir gyur pa'i sems can rnams*; $ASVy_{t,P}$ 240b2: *kun nas mnar sems kyi rgyur gyur pa['i] sems can rnams*. Cf. $ASBh_{t,P}$ 58a2-3 *kun nas mnar sems kyi rgyur gyur pa'i sems can rnams*. • $ASVy_c$ 727c9 translates "causing injury to the beings " (諸有情能爲損害, $ASVy_j$ 150,6: 諸の有情に能く損害を爲す).

[76] The correction of *pāruṣāṇām* to *pāruṣyasya bhāṣaṇam* is made in analogy to the next section (ASBh §63(vii)), the explanation of "idle prattle": *niṣṭhāgamanaṃ tasya bhāṣaṇam* (ASBh 64,04). The misspelling *pāruṣāṇām* perhaps had something to do with the above-mentioned orthographical problem (*-*ṣyasya*). ▪ SAKUMA (*Index*, p. 24) proposes the very helpful conjecture *pāruṣyabhāṣaṇam*, pointing to the similarity between the Tibetan rendering, *ngag rtsub po smras pa'o*, and that of the preceding sentence (ASBh 64,3), which reads *ngag rtsub po'i* ($ASBh_{t,P}$ 57b8) for *pāruṣyasya*. In SAKUMA's index, *ngag* is in both instances misspelled as "*dag*"; the Tibetan rendering of *pāruṣyasya* is presented omitting the genitive particle, i.e. "*ngag rtsub po*"; **pāruṣyasya* is misspelled as "*pāruśyasya*"; the spelling "*pāruṣasya*" in the MS is not mentioned.

Furthermore, the reconstruction of a compound on the base of the Tibetan (*ngag rtsub po smras pa*) is not necessarily justified, as in the next sentence the *genitivus objectivus* of the Sanskrit (*tasya bhāṣaṇam*, ASBh 64,04) is not represented by a Tibetan particle (*de smras pa*). • The Tibetan rendering of *bhāṣaṇam* in the perfect tense (i.e. *smras pa*) underlines the completion of the act. A chronological distinction between an action and its completion is explicitly made at AKBh 239,14-16, but it was probably not intended in this passage of the ASBh.

[77] BU STON mentions various, partly conflicting views on idle prattle. The first of those is that all talk under the influence of the defilements is idle prattle (*tshig kyal ni / kha cig / nyon mongs can gyi tshig thams cad la 'dod /*, AS-Bu-ston, p. 518,2-3). Some claim that all other wordly talk apart from lying, slander, and harsh words are idle prattle. For example: flattery, reciting non-Buddhist treatises while singing and dancing, wailing, bustling entertainment, and so on (*kha cig / rdzun sogs gsum las gzhan pa'i tshig la 'dod de / kha gsag dang / glu dang / zlos gar gyis phyi rol pa'i bstan bcos 'don pa dang / smre sngags dang / 'du 'dzi'i gtam la sogs pa'o //*, AS-Bu-ston, p. 518,2). The song of ordination (?) at the time of a Cakravartin is not idle prattle (*'khor los bsgyur ba'i tshe nges byung dang len gi glu yin pas 'dir mi 'gyur*, AS-Bu-ston, p. 518,3). BU STON seems to agree with the following, third view: Even though there is a lot of useless talk among what is spoken (or recited), for example when sending off and receiving a bride, that is, nonetheless, not idle prattle to the extent of a full path of action (*kha cig / bag ma gtong len gyi tshig sogs brjod pas tshig bkyal yod kyang las kyi lam min zer ro //*, AS-Bu-ston, p. 518,4).

[78] The exact meaning of *saṃbhinna* in this context is not clear to me. It seems to convey the connotations of something that is actually unrelated but artificially thrown together, i.e. "diffuse", "mixed up", "confused". On *saṃbhinna*, see CPD, s.v. *asambhinna*, and PTSD, s.v. *sambhinna*. It seems that *saṃbhinna* and *asaṃbhinna* were confused by the scribe at ASBh 62,22. See AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 354, n. 717. RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 83) renders *saṃbhinnapralāpa* as "bavardage oiseux" (pointless chitchat), BOIN-WEBB (in ASAṄGA, *Compendium*, p. 113) as "idle talk".

[79] Cf. ASVy$_c$ 727c10: "a meaning that entails what is not useful" (能引攝不饒益義). • Cf. YBh 177,7 (ed. AYMORÉ) *anarthopasaṃhitavāditayānarthavādī*. AYMORÉ, *Karma*, p. 102: "'Einer, der Unsinn redet', weil er eine Rede führt, die nicht mit einem heilsamen Zweck verbunden ist." The explanations of the YBh correspond to SĀ 129c7 (令是義饒益莫令非義饒益) and AN III, p. 196 (*atthasaṃhitena vakkhāmi no anatthasaṃhitena*).

[80] I found no direct explanation *why* idle prattle is bad, except that one's words are not paid heed to, which is its *niṣyandaphala*. Contemporary Tibetan teachers of course, jokingly warn us of people who, instead of saying *mantra*s, rather chatter away, moving the *mālā* through their fingers, but even before the times that Buddhist laypeople were expected to say *mantra*s, it seems that they were encouraged to show some amount of the "sedate demeanour expected of an ascetic" (on which see SCHMITHAUSEN, *Sentience of Plants*, p. 52). ▪ In that way, the condemnation of idle prattle shows a faint hint of the idea that an unwholesome deed can be bad for the agent, even if it does no harm so someone

else (on which see SCHMITHAUSEN, *op.cit.*, p. 60f.). ▪ In this context, I would like to point to well-know list of unwholesome actions in the *Mahānidānasutta* (DN II, p. 59,1-3. For the sake of simplicity, I refer to the Pāli version here. On various versions of the *Mahānidānasūtra*, see SCHMITHAUSEN, "Zur zwölfgliedrigen Formel", p. 48, n. 28.), in a passage that explains how, due to thirst, various (*aneke*) forms of unwholesome, bad actions come about due to "thirst": taking up sticks and weapons, strife, quarrel, dispute, etc. The style of the sutta is rather narrative, in this passage even dramatic, and was probably a quite popular element in *sutta* recitations, for we find the phrase it in different *nikāya* sections of the Pāli canon. It is not *abhidharma* style. The sentence describes interpersonal strife (or, resource allocation conflicts, to be more technical) in its various manifestations, but it does not present a list aiming at comprehensiveness. As for speech acts, the *sutta* mentions slander (*pesuñña*) and lying (*musāvāda*), which we know from the tenfold list, as well as dispute (*vivāda*) and various forms of quarrel which might be verbal as well as physical. Even though "harsh words" would semantically fit in nicely in that sutta passage, it is a little more abstract (*vāk* instead of *vāda*) and it was possibly preferred to *vivāda* in the tenfold list a.) because one could not reasonably prohibit a layperson to answer in a dispute, and b.) because it takes two to actively engage in a *vivāda*. The point I want to make here is this: "idle prattle" would not fit into the *sutta* passage at all (it has little to do with strife and quarrel), which is another indication that it is of a different nature than the other three unwholesome speech acts. And conversely, the tenfold list clearly emphasizes other aspects of unwholesomeness than the *Mahānidānasutta* passage (on which see also SCHMITHAUSEN, "Zur zwölfgliedrigen Formel", p. 50, n. 38, and DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 527f., n. 162).

[81] Against $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ *bya bar*, $ASVy_{t,P}$ reads *byas par*, thereby missing the point ("being certain to have made that one's own").

[82] "Covetousness" is only an approximate translation of *abhidhyā*, which means being both rationally decided and emotionally fixated upon physically making another's property one's own. • See YBh 178,3-4 (ed. AYMORÉ): *parasve rāgaṃ adhipatiṃ kṛtvā svīkaraṇaniścayotpattyadhivāsanatayā tīvrasaṃrāgaḥ*. AYMORÉ, *Karma*, p. 105: "Nachdem dieser die Gier auf den Besitz anderer zu seinem leitenden Faktor gemacht hat, ‹kommt› 'intensive Gier' ‹bei ihm zustande›, weil er es duldet, daß der Entschluß, sich ‹fremden Besitz› anzueignen, ‹in seinem Denken› entsteht." AYMORÉ (*Karman*, p. 77) translates *abhidhyā* as "Habgier". • AK IV.77 (AKBh 247,10): *abhidhyā tu parasvaviṣamaspṛhā*. BAREAU, "Abhidharmakośakārikā" (s.v. *abhidhyā*): "Yearning is the wish to appropriate to one's self the property of others by dishonest way". See also LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (*Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 167).

[83] AS_t renders as *vittopakaraṇam* as a *dvandva* (*nor dang yo byad*). The Chinese term 資財 (AS_c) is explained by TŌDŌ, MATSUMOTO, and TAKEDA (*Kanjigen*, s.v.) as "basic property", or "inheritance".

[84] I translate Skt. *niścaya* as "certainty" here. Note that AKBh 247,10 uses *icchā* ("wish, desire, inclination") in its stead (*svīkaraṇecchā*). The idea of *niścaya* in the AS and YBh passages seems to be that of a fixation on doing a certain act, a decided aiming at that act.

In the present case: "making that one's own" (*svīkaraṇa*). • Tib. *nges pa* is normally better rendered as "certainty". See ERB, *Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti*, p. 168, n. 668.

85 The extremely elliptic phrase *āśayas tatra tatsaṃjñinas tathārucih / prayogas tatsvīkaraṇa* is difficult to construe. I wonder whether that fact is connected with its being located in the bottom margin of the ASBh MS. Is it a later addition or part of a proto-ASVy?

86 Also here, the Tibetan verb (or verbal noun) seems to be in past tense (*bsad pa*). This is probably a slip of the pen by an editor thinking that *zin par byas pa* must go with the past tense.

87 RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 83) renders *vyāpāda* as "inimité" (enmity, hostility); Boin-Webb (ASAṄGA, *Compendium*, p. 113): "ill-will".

88 See also my notes ad AS 55,1-2 (*saṃmoha*).

89 The Tibetan and Chinese translations may have read *asat°*. $ASBh_{t,P}$ *yod pa la med par 'du shes shing* ($ASVy_{t,P}$ 240b5: *yod pa med par ...*); $ASVy_c$ 727c15-16: 於實有起非有想.

90 For canonical sources and other parallels, see PĀSĀDIKA, *Kanonische Zitate*, p. 96: A quotation at AKBh 293,22 mentions *saṃcetanīyaṃ karma* (*saṃcetanīyaṃ karma kṛtvā kiṃ pratvedayata ity ayaṃ vibhajyavyākaraṇīyaḥ praśnaḥ /*). MOCHIZUKI (*Bukkyō daijiten*, s.v. 故作業) refers to a sentence in the third volume of MĀ (若し故作業あらば我れ説く ...), which I have identified as MĀ 437b26 (T 26).

91 My translation as "intentional" does not fully reflect the fact that the prefix *saṃ* may indicate completeness, i.e. that *saṃcetanīya* may refer to a more conscious and reflected thought act than *cetanā* and similar words. See, e.g., SCHMITHAUSEN, *Buddhism and Nature*, p. 30 (*sañcicca* = "knowingly").

92 $AS_{t,P}$ *'byung*; $ASVy_{t,P}$ *bshad*. The alteration from *'byung* to *bshad* can only be found in the $ASVy_t$ (also: ad AS 54,1). It is a minor clarification which can be done safely without opposing the original translation. Such minor changes are often found in the ASVy and they were probably done by NYI MA RGYAL MTSHAN. • Tib. *zhes gang 'byung ba* is only tentatively reconstructed as Skt. *yad uktam ... iti*, in analogy with AS 19,13f. and AS 84,11 (see also AKBh-Index-Tib, s.v. *'byung*). Various ways of indicating quotations are known, as the following chart (examples from AS, ASBh, YBh) will show:

1. Reference to *sūtra* with *ucyate*:

YBh 222,1: *ucyate*	$YBh_{t,P}$ *dzi* 130a7: *zhes bya*
YBh 199,8: *ucyate ... iti*	$YBh_{t,P}$ *dzi* 116a3: *zhes bya*

2. Reference to *sūtra* with *uktam*:

YBh 137,2: *uktam*	YBh$_{t,P}$ *dzi* 81a2: *zhes bya ba [...] gsungs pa*
AS 19,13f.: yad uktam ... iti	AS$_{t,P}$ 69a3: *zhes gang gsungs pa*
AS 84,11: *yad uktam ... iti*	AS$_{t,P}$ 124b2: *zhes gang gsungs pa*
YBh 127,10: *yad uktam ... iti*	YBh$_{t,P}$ *dzi* 75a1: *zhes bya ba [...] gsungs pa*
YBh 127,19: *yad apy uktam ... iti*	YBh$_{t,P}$ *dzi* 75b1: *zhes gsungs pa gang yin pa de yang*
YBh 127,19: *yad apy uktam ... iti*	YBh$_{t,P}$ *dzi* 75b4: *zhes gsungs pa gang yin pa de la yang*
YBh 128,5: *yad apy uktam ... iti*	YBh$_{t,P}$ *dzi* 75b6: *zhes gsungs pa gang yin pa de la yang*
YBh 213,19: *yad uktam ... iti*	YBh$_{t,P}$ *dzi* 125b2: *zhes gang gsungs pa*
YBh 196,15-197,3: *yad uktam ... iti*	YBh$_{t,P}$ *dzi* 115a1: *zhes gsungs*
YBh 171,6: *yathoktam*	YBh$_{t,P}$ *dzi* 100a2: *ji skad gsungs pa*
ASBh 93,5: *yathoktam*	ASBh$_{t,P}$ 83b1: *zhes gsungs pa lta bu*

[93] I reconstruct *katamā saṃcetanīyatā* in analogy to the following explanations in the ASBh which, however, have *saṃcetanīyatā* only *in fine compositi.*

[94] This is one of the instances where the issue of indirect responsibility is touched upon. Note that the *karman* of the commander is not discussed here. I assume that this passage is primarily meant to provide the individual Buddhist with spiritual guidance in such a situation, and I here think primarily of war. If war and the army were openly criticized, it would bring the Buddhist order into conflict with the state, so what we find here is only a moderate criticism of unwholesome action on command. Clearly, the command chains of the army and the actions of the individual soldier are not glorified, in contrast to non-Buddhist texts like the *Bhagavadgītā*, but on the other hand, the conflict with the state is avoided at the expense of scholastic (and moral?) consistency. At AS 58,3-7, in contrast, butchers are styled *asaṃvara*. See SCHMITHAUSEN, *Buddhism and Nature*, p. 8f., id., "Gewalt und Gewaltlosigkeit", pp. 5-9, id., "Meat-Eating and Nature", p. 195, and also my notes ad ASBh 63,16-17.

[95] Note that the ASBh implies a distinction between "wish" (*iccha*) and "purpose" (*abhisaṃdhi*) here.

[96] ASBh$_{t,P}$ "being requested" (*gsol ba btab nas*); ASVy$_c$ 727c23: "because of the request" (勸請因).

[97] ASBh$_{MS}$ illegible, but *eva* seems to be correct. It stands in the place of *api* in the previous sentence ("although unwilling"). ASBh$_{t,P}$ in both cases "while he does not want

it" (*mi 'dod bzhin du*, = ASVy$_{t,P}$ 240b7-8). ASVy$_c$ 727c21,23 in both cases "although he does not desire it" (雖不欲樂).

98 The *la don* after *nyes pa* is strange. Still, I preserve it as a *lectio difficilior*, expressing "not understanding [those actions] *as* virtues or faults."

99 Skt. *abhiniveśa*: ERB, *Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti*, p. 35: "das hartnäckige Festhalten". AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 323, n. 577: "das Sichanklammern".

100 My translation does not follow the Tibetan "fixation on ..." (*rtsa ba la* ...). Cf. ASVy$_c$ 727c26: 根本執著. In general, *abhiniveśa* is constructed with various cases. See ERB, *Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti*, p. 120f., n. 188.

101 Note that the basic defilements ("roots of the unwholesome [actions]", *akuśalamūlaiḥ*) here precede the intentional (*abhisamdhāya...*) act.

102 For Skt. *tīvra* (which I translate as "violent"), cf. ASBh$_{t,P}$ "fierce, violent" (*drag po*), ASVy$_c$ 727c28: "fierce" (猛利). MAYRHOFER, *Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* (s.v.) "stark, scharf, heftig, stechend, intensiv...."

103 Wholesome *karman* is in the AKBh (*kṣemaṃ karma kuśalaṃ yad iṣṭavipākaṃ nirvāṇaprāpakaṃ ca duḥkhaparitrāṇāt*, AKBh 226,7) and in the YBh (YBh$_{t,P}$ *zi* 70b2f, YBh$_c$ 608b26f., see KRAMER, *Fünf*-vastu-*Abschnitt*, p. 134, n. 173) defined as that which brings about a desirable result, or the attainment of *nirvāṇa*. On misconceptions as to what is wholesome, see also below, notes ad AS 53,8-10 (*mithyādṛṣṭi*), or AS 55,1-2 (**phalavipākasaṃmūḍha*).

104 The term *āyatyām* is often translated into Chinese as "in a future lifetime" (於當來世, YBh-Index-CST), but here ASVy$_c$ has "in the future" (當來).

105 The Sanskrit term *phala* can also be translated as "result" in almost all occurrences in this book. Still, I translate it more literally as "fruit" because the metaphor will be of some importance when discussing the effects of *karman* on agriculture, below.

106 AKBh 271,17: *kṛtaṃ copacitaṃ ca karmocyate* /. Both Chinese translations of the AKBh take that to be a sūtra quotation, and so does HONJŌ (*Agon zenpyō*, p. 74), who could unfortunately not locate the original sūtra. PĀSĀDIKA (*Kanonische Zitate*) has no entry for this passage. SAEKI (*Kandō*, scroll 18, p. 14b) refers to a certain 業報差別経 (?). • MN III, p. 207 states that one has to experience intended *karman* once it has been done (*saṃcetanikaṃ ... kammaṃ katvā ... kiṃ so vedityati*). According to AN V, p. 292, *Karman* that is done and heaped up is necessarily experienced (lit. "not ... not to be experienced", *na ... appaṭisaṃveditvā*. The PTS edition reads *appaṭisaṃviditvā*. Correction to *appaṭisaṃveditvā* according to ENOMOTO, *Annihilation of* karman, p. 44f.). For more references, see LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 242, n. 1, and id., *Morale*, p. 203.

107 The terms "fruit" (*phala*) and "ripening" (*vipāka*) overlap, but they are not completely synonymous. *Phala* may refer to results of various causes, not necessarily karmic, while *vipāka* is normally refers to karmic results. See KRAMER, *Fünf*-vastu-*Abschnitt*, p. 129f.,

nos. 148, 151 and BUESCHER, *Vijñānavāda*, p. 112f. In the context of *karman* doctrine, *vipāka* can indicate, quite specifically, rebirth in a certain realm due to one's *karman*, or to the body obtained at birth. ▪ A distinction between *vipākapaccaya* and *kammapaccaya* can be found in the Theravāda Abhidhamma work *Paṭṭhāna*. As far as I gather from the synopsis in NYANATILOKA's *Buddhist Dictionary* (s.v. *paccaya*, s.a. p. 395), *kammapaccaya* deals with the results of good and bad actions, i.e. their role in the origination of various phenomena, while *vipākapaccaya* seems to focus more on personal continuity, both physical and mental, or, to use an expression from SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 57, the "psycho-physical [...] nucleus of personal existence that is the result of Maturation." See also HALBFASS, *Karma und Wiedergeburt*, p. 116.

108 Also according to AKBh 272,17-20, *karman* has to be done consciously to be heaped up (*kathaṃ karmopacitaṃ bhavati [...] saṃcintya kṛtaṃ bhavati nābuddhipūrvaṃ na sahasā kṛtam /*). But cf. YBh 190,9-12. • The *Karmavibhaṅga* contains a full *catuṣkoṭi* on *kṛta* and *upacita* (*aṣṭi karma kṛtam nopacitam / aṣṭi karmopacitam na kṛtam / aṣṭi karma kṛtam upacitam / aṣṭi karma naiva kṛtam nopacitam /*). KUDŌ (*Karmavibhaṅga*, p. 26). Among those, *karman* that is neither done nor accumulated must be rather irrelevant, and *karman* that is accumulated but not done must be highly controversial. It fits in well with the overall pragmatic approach of the AS that it contains no mention of such things.

109 I found no elegant way to render the dynamic aspect of *bhavati* in this context. See also DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 588, n. 319.

110 YBh parallel: In the *Savitarkādibhūmi*, YBh 190,6-7: *kṛtaṃ karma katamat/ yac cetitaṃ cetayitvā vā* (YBh_{MS} *cetayitvā vā*; $YBh_{BHATTACHARYA}$ *cetayitvā*) *punaḥ kāyena vācā samutthāpitaṃ /*; $YBh_{t,P}$ *dzi* 110b4: *byas pa'i las gang zhe na / bsams pa'am bsams nas kyang lus dang ngag gis kun nas bslangs* ($YBh_{t,D}$ *bslangs*; $YBh_{t,P}$ *bslang*) *pa gang yin pa'o //*. See also YBh_c 319b13f.

111 Skt. *samudācāra* can be used also in the sense of "to display" [certain acts]. ERB, *Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti*, p. 100: "zeigen (wörtl. vollbringen)". Also the Chinese equivalent, 現行, conveys the aspect of visibility: The graph 現 (visible, to be seen; actual, acute) was originally developed from 見 (to see, to be seen). See TŌDŌ, MATSUMOTO, and TAKEDA, *Kanjigen*, s.v. 現 . On *samudācāra*, see also MATHES, *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, pp. 93, 150: "da die Erscheinungsformen [immer noch] auftreten" (*mtshan ma kun tu spyod pa*, **nimittasamudācāra*), and AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśa*s*, p. 366 ("das aktuelle Auftreten"), SCHMITHAUSEN, *Nirvāṇa-Abschnitt*, p. 85, n. 21, id. *External World*, p. 15, n. 14 ("full, actual emergence", ad AS 35,3 and 15f.), and COX, *Disputed Dharmas*, p. 79: "present operation". Less precise is LAMOTTE's (*Somme*, p. 213) equivalent "commettre (*samudācār-*) [des péchés de nature]" (MSg VI.3.I). On 現, indicating direct perception, see also DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 417, n. 61, and SCHMITHAUSEN, *External World*, p. 59f. • AKBh 248,12-13: *ya ete daśākuśalāḥ karmapathāḥ sarva ete kuśalānāṃ karmaṇāṃ samudācāravirodhinaḥ*. For *sarva ete kuśalānāṃ*, PRADHAN (AKBh) reads *sarve ete kuśalānāṃ*, but refers to AKVy 411,9: *sarva ete 'kuśalānāṃ* [sic]. For *kuśalānāṃ karmaṇāṃ*, AKBh-Index-Skt, p. 432 reads *kuśalānāṃ dharmaṇāṃ* (=FUNAHASHI, *Gōbon*, p. 384, n. 1). $AKBh_{t,PD}$ *dge ba'i chos*

rnams; AKBh$_{c,X}$ 善法.

[112] I have reconstructed *upacaya* in accordance with the ASBh. According to PAHLKE (*Vijñāna-Abschnitt des Pañcaskandhaka*, p. 34f.), Tib. *bsags pa* can stand for Skt. *cita*. (The sentence in the *Pañcaskandhaka* is: *sems ni kun gzhi rnam par shes pa ste / 'di ltar de ni 'du byed thams cad kyi sa bon bsags pa'o*). Tib. *bsags pa* would then be interpreted in a passive sense, i.e. "[the *ālayavijñāna* is that where seeds] have accumulated". Note, however, that in the context of this AS passage, if we were to reconstruct a *ppp*, the meaning "increase, thrive, abound" would fit much better. CAPPELER (*Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, s.v. *ci*), presents this as the meaning of *ci* in the passive.

[113] What exactly the AS author means by *vṛddhi* here is not clear. A controversial issue in Buddhist *karma* doctrine is the (quasi-automatic) increase of merit. In the *Abhidharmakośa*, the Vaibhāṣika holds that when there is no (more) volition, merit can increase only because of the *avijñapti* while the so-called Sautrāntika objects that merit increases because of the habit to do meritorious acts (AKBh 196,12-16, 197,20-198,1, LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, pp. 15f., 20f.). The AS probably does not discuss this issue in as much detail as the AKBh *because* it is controversial. Also the *Śalistambasūtra* teaches that a large result can come from a small cause in the context of origination in dependence. See SCHOENING, *Śalistambasūtra*, p. 287 and FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 52.

[114] This the only occurrence of the term "impression" (*vāsanā*) in the AS section under research. The term *vāsanā* was probably also used outside classical Yogācāra thought. It appears several times in (XUANZANG's translation of) the **Mahāvibhāṣā* 42c1 and so on; Note that the older **Vibhāsā*, T 1546, p. 31a25 has no passage that would correspond to **Mahāvibhāṣā*, p. 42c1). In the **Mahāvibhāṣā* passage, *vāsanā* denotes the reminiscences of certain defilements (*kleśa*) that the Arhat has not yet abandoned but only the Buddha has. On that doctrine, see AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 308, n. 521, with reference to AS 100,16f. (*vāsanā samudghātena kiṃ karma karoti* etc.) and the respective explanations in ASBh 131,10f.. The meaning of the term seems to have changed significantly once it was used in the Yogācāra context (see KRITZER, *Rebirth and Causation*, p. 94, n. 221). On *vāsanā* in the *Yogabhāṣya*, see POTTER, "Karma Theory", p. 243.

[115] The *Viṃśatikā* makes it clear that the results of imprints only appear as external phenomena while actually they are nothing but mental events. *Viṃśatikāvṛtti*, p. 5: "Where there is the imprint, just there is its fruit. Why don't you uphold such a transformation of consciousness?" (*yatra vāsanā tatraiva tasyāḥ phalaṃ tādṛśo vijñānapariṇāmaḥ kiṃ neṣyate /*). See also FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, pp. 358, 370 and SCHMITHAUSEN, "Sautrāntika-Voraussetzungen", p. 116. The current AS passage and the ASBh explanation do not mention such a doctrine, but it is clearly expressed at AS 3,3 (**yac ca tasya (or: tad-) bījam upacitam vaipākyam cālayavijñānam*, reconstructed by SCHMITHAUSEN, "Once again MSg I.8", p. 157, n. 30) and the respective comments at ASBh 2,22f. FRAUWALLNER (*op.cit.*, p. 328) suggests that the doctrines of seeds, imprints, and an unconscious subcurrent of consciousness were modelled after similar doctrines in the Mahīśāsaka school.

[116] It is unknown to me which model of seeds (*bīja*) exactly underlies this phrase. At TrBh 16,1ff., "nourishing of the imprints" (*vāsanāparipoṣa*) seems to indicate the gradual growth of an imprint leading to its culmination: the actualization of a corresponding thought habit. See SCHMITHAUSEN, "Sautrāntika-Voraussetzungen", p. 133f. ▪ At MSg I.48 seeds are considered either small, middling, or great (*de la thos pa'i bag chags kyi sa bon chung ngu dang 'bring ba dang chen po...*). See FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 349. At MSg I.46, Asaṅga describes a process which, I think, could rightly be understood as the process of "increase": based on a small imprint, a middling imprint comes about, and based on a middling imprint, a big imprint, through continuous study and practice (*bag chags chung ngu la brten nas bag chags 'bring [po] 'gyur te / bag chags 'bring po la brten nas bag chags chen po 'gyur / thos pa dang bsam pa dang bsgom pa lan mang du bya[s] pa dang ldan pa'i phyir ro/*). The passages MSg I.46 and 48 deal with the imprints (*bag chags*) of purification, while TrBh 16,1ff. deals with the misconception of a Self, a cause for entanglement in *saṃsāra*. Even though those examples thus stand in a soteriological context, the process is quite surely applicable to worldly *karman*, too. ▪ Also in Sthiramati's *Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa-vaibhāṣya* is "heaping up" (*bsags pa*) equated with "nurturing" (*yongs su gsos pa*). It is further equated with being followed by (*rjes su 'brel ba*, **anubaddha*) the seeds of the *saṃskāras* (*'du byed*). See PAHLKE, *Vijñāna-Abschnitt des Pañcaskandhaka*, p. 34f. (P 5567, fol. 45b3f.). On another occasion, the same text specifies that both, the imprints [that bring about] ripening (*rnam par smin pa'i bag chags*), and the "concordant imprints" (*rgyu mthun pa'i bag chags*), located in the *ālayavijñāna* can be "nurtured" (*gso ba*) by deliberate (*mngon par 'du byas*) actions. The imprint that brings about ripening then conditions the *ālayavijñāna* in such a way that it manifests (*'grub*) as the ripening itself (*rnam par smin pa'i bdag nyid du*), while the "concordant imprints" condition the *ālayavijñāna* in such a way that other wholesome or unwholesome impulses (*'du byed rnams*) appear (*'byung*, PAHLKE, *op.cit.*, p. 38f., ad P 5567, fol. 46a3-5). Note that this conception of "concordant" (*rgyu mthun*) here is completely different from the concept of "concordant fruit" in the sense of an *experience* in the human realm (*myong ba rgyu mthun*, see my notes ad ASBh 65,1-2), while it conforms exclusively the concept of habit formation (*byed pa rgyu mthun*. That, of course, carries the danger of determinism, on which see my notes in the introduction). By habitual actions, the imprint is nurtured, leading to the perpetuation of that very habit. See also PAHLKE, *op.cit.*, pp. 98-101, ad P 5567, fol. 53a2-4: The defilements nourish their own seeds (*rang gi sa bon*), and those are later actualized as defilements once the "specific transformation of the mental continuum (*rgyun 'gyur ba'i bye brag*)" happens. The seeds are stored in the *ālayavijñāna* (PAHLKE, *op.cit.*, p. 102, ad P 5567, fol. 53a7). ▪ The relation between "imprints" and "seeds" is not absolutely clear in this ASBh passage. It seems that the idea here basically corresponds to the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi* (ed. LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, p. 105), rendering the opinion of Nanda and Śrīsena, saying that *vāsanā* is a synonym for *bīja*. An in fact it seems that *bīja* and *vāsanā* normally refer to the same thing, but that, in accordance with the metaphors used, *vāsanā* describes it as the residue of a cause, while *bīja* expresses its potential to bring forth a future result. On the implications and the problematic of the seed metaphor for karmic imprints, see WALDRON, *Buddhist Unconscious*, pp. 73-76.

[117] The absence of the term *ālayavijñāna* in this whole AS section on *karman* is remarkable, as the *ālayavijñāna* is explicitly mentioned at AS 3,3f. and AS 12,1. It must be noted, nonetheless, that *karman* is not mentioned in both AS passages, but only in the lengthy explanations of the ASBh ad AS 12,1f. Both AS passages stress the role of the *ālayavijñāna* in bringing forth internal and external phenomena, the *skandhas*, *dhātus* and so on, but there is mention neither of wholesomeness or unwholesomeness, nor of joy or suffering as a reward. Clearly, the ontological aspect dominates over the moral one. See also Buescher, *Vijñānavāda*, p. 111, n. 1. • On the term *kun tu len pa'i rnam par shes pa* in the ASVy$_t$, see also my notes on NYI MA RGYAL MTSHAN's revision in the introduction. • AS-Mi-pham 457,3-4: "Accumulation [means] that the imprints, the seeds for ripening in the base-consciousness, are fostered and increase." (*bsags pa ni bag chags kun gzhi'i rnam par shes pa la rnam par smin pa'i sa bon gsos 'phel ba'o).* This is notably an occasion where MI PHAM found it necessary to include ASBh text. It seems that he would not have been satisfied with an AS section on *karman* that lacks a reference to the *ālayavijñāna*.

[118] Parallel: MaVyu 2311: *niyatavedanīyam* (Tib. *myong bar 'gyur ba nges pa*). • Cf. YBh 190,16: *niyatavedanīyaṃ karma yat saṃcintya kṛtam upacitaṃ ca /*; AKBh 229,20f.: *dṛṣṭadharmavedanīyam upapadyavedanīyam aparaparyāyavedanīyaṃ cety etat trividhaṃ karma niyatam ity etac caturvidhaṃ karma bhavati sahāniyatavedanīyena /.* • The issue of certainty is discussed at AKBh 229,24-230,13 (AK IV.50). See also LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 114f., n. 1, id., *Morale*, pp. 203, 208-210. At MSg I.23, seeds are said to be "certain" (*nges pa*). According to the commentary (LAMOTTE, Somme, vol. 2, p. 40), this means that results only arise from the appropriate seeds, an explanation which resembles that of *anurūpahetuphalārtha* in the ASBh (although the ASBh does not mention *bīja* in that context). See KRITZER, *Rebirth and Causation*, p. 210. Also KHANG DKAR (*Deb ther gser po*, p. 169f.) mentions various views on *nges pa* (*niyama*, *niyata*). See also LAMOTTE ("Traité de l'acte", p. 152f.). • In his *Xianyang shengjiao lun*, Asaṅga distinguishes five kinds of certainty in connection with *karman*. The first three are the chronological aspects (this life, next life, thereafter), which the AS has subsumed under "the certainty of time". In the *Xianyang shengjiao lun*, those three are followed by "the certainty of the result", and "the certainty of doing the action" (又如是業有五種決定。一現法受決定。二生受決定。三後差別受決定。四受報決定。五作業決定, *Xianyang shengjiao lun* 573c19-21). The same fivefold list is repeated in the YBh commentary T 1828 (瑜伽論記, 362b11-12) also there without any further explanations. For the sake of comparison, I provide the lists in Chinese below:

AS	*Xianyang shengjiao lun*
1. 作業決定。	現法受決定 (corresponds to 3.) 生受決定 (corresponds to 3.) 後差別受決定(corresponds to 3.)
2. 受異熟決定。	受報決定(corresponds to 2.)

3. 分位決定。	作業決定(corresponds to 1.)

It is quite obvious that the arrangement of the AS is more systematic, both in the order of the three items as well as in its subsuming the chronological aspects under one header. Still, it is only the respective explanations ASBh 64,27-29 that inform us about the three subdivisions of the "certainty of time". Those three aspects are mentioned and explained far below, at AS 58,18-59,4, and without an oral or written commentary, one would not know that they are actually what is meant by "certainty of time".

119 For the reconstruction *yad uktam*, see my notes ad AS 53,15.

120 The first two items bear some resemblance with the two kinds of concordant fruit (*niṣyandaphala*), i.e. concordant with the deed (Tib. *byed pa rgyu mthun pa*) and concordant with the experience (Tib. *myong ba rgyu mthun pa*). For those two terms, see my notes ad ASBh 65,1-2. See also HEUPERS, "Foundation of Buddhist Ethics, p. 54, n. 27.

121 RAHULA's explanation (*Compendium*, p. 84, n. 9) basically accords to that of the ASBh: "A certain act in that life necessarily or inevitably comes about as the result of a previous action". • The idea that any karmically effective action can be caused by previous *karman* could easily imply some kind of a chain reaction or even strict determinism (on which see the respective section in the introduction).

122 Although $\text{ASVy}_{\text{t,PD}}$ *rgyun 'gyur* is not wrong, the most common rendering for *saṃtāna* is *rgyud*. I assume that an original *rgyud* was misread as *rgyur* very early in the Tibetan transmission, *ra* and *da* being graphically similar.

123 Skt. *phalasaṃtānapariṇāmād* resembles the key expression *pariṇāmaviṣeśa* in the writings of Vasubandhu. See SCHMITHAUSEN, "Sautrāntika-Voraussetzungen", pp. 114-116 and COX, *Disputed Dharmas*, p. 215, n. 38f.

124 ASBh_{MS} *phalasaṃtānamapariṇāmād* with a (hardly visible) elision mark above *ma*.

125 This refers to the above (AS 53,15-17) explanations on "being intended because of clinging to the roots" (*mūlābhiniveśasaṃcetanīyatā*) and "being intended because of wrong views" (*viparyāsasaṃcetanīyatā*), "the ripening [of which] is not [something] not to be experienced" (*vipāko nāpratisaṃvedanīyaḥ*, ASBh 64,27). See also RAHULA, *Compendium*, p. 84, n. 10.

126 For more details on this classification, see below, AS 58,18-59,3. • On the expression *dṛṣṭadharma* ("this current lifetime"), see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 475, n. 23.

127 This passage (AS 54,3-10; ASBh 65,1-66,5) has been discussed in detail by Robert KRITZER ("Additional Leaf"). The additional leaf from the ASVy (ASBh 65,7-26 in TATIA's edition) for the most part corresponds to AKBh 253,24-254,5 and 254,7-254,11; *Abhidharmadīpa* 177,7-19; YBh 183,18-184,9, **Mahāvibhāṣā* 588c8-589a18. In the last lines of the back side, anyhow, contain text that is original AS and ASVy text. • The above-mentioned Abhidharma expositions closely resemble AN IV, pp. 247-249, which lists various results of unwholesome actions. The AN exposition differs in various points:

1.) The discourse is addressed to monks. 2.) There is no mention of environmental factors, i.e. the equivalent to the *adhipatiphala*. 3.) The results are presented correspond to the fruit of ripening and the concordant fruit without being designated as such. 4.) There is no mention of wholesome actions. 5.) Instead of the ten paths of action, the sutta discusses only the seven physical and vocal actions, plus the imbibing of intoxicants. As a whole, there is more focus on the avoidance of scandalous *behaviour* and less on the *intention* behind it, or on agricultural factors, which fits in well with the discourse being addressed to monks. Note that no Chinese equivalent for this sutta is listed in AKANUMA, *Goshōroku*. For further references, see LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 186, n. 2, and p. 187, n. 1. • Although the additional leaf (ASVy) here quotes the AS almost completely, I present also the AS version (along with the translations) for the sake of consistency, even though this may seem redundant. Because any rendering of the additional leaf is missing in the $ASBh_t$, I present the text of $ASVy_t$. • The correspondence of this additional leaf to the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and to the *Abhidharmadīpa* has already been noticed by JAINI (*Abhidharmadīpa* 177, n. 3), see also TATIA (ASBh, p. xxviii). SHINODA ("Seiritsu nendai", p. 880) further says that the ASVy quotes from the YBh (which is not completely correct, see KRITZER, "Additional Leaf"), and that the ASVy and AKBh passages are completely identical. • KRITZER ("Additional Leaf") underlines most parts of ASBh 66,1-3 with a dotted line, indicating portions not recognized by TATIA as root text from the AS. It is true that TATIA rather arbitrarily declares parts of the ASVy explanations not to be part of the AS, in analogy to his proceeding in ASBh 65,1-5 (cf. also ASBh 64, n. 2). However, the last sentence of the additional leaf (*yathākuśalānāṃ karmapathānāṃ vipākaphalādi triphalāvasthānaṃ kṛtam*) is, against KRITZER (loc. cit.), not found in AS_t, but is an original phrase from the ASVy (to be found in $ASVy_t$). • The additional leaf contains no margin notation indication of recto or verso (the other folios of $ASBh_{MS}$ have the folio number on verso, i.e. B). Curiously, the recto of the additional leaf has been photographed along with the B sides, verso among the A sides. • Five kinds of fruit (*phala*) are listed at AS 103,4-5. • The results of the Six Perfections are depicted in terms of the five fruits at ASBh 110,19-24. This forms part of a lengthy discussion of the Six Perfections (ASBh 102,5-112,7, paragraph 131 in TATIA's system).

[128] KRITZER ("Additional Leaf") proposes the rendering "maturational result"; LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 185): "fruit de rétribution". • The *vipākaphala* functions by the principle of strict individual retribution (see AKBh 95,16: *asādhāraṇas tu vipākaḥ /*). See also KRAMER, *Fünf-vastu-Abschnitt*, p. 159, n. 294.

[129] XUANZANG has inserted the explanation from the ASBh (or ASVy) into his AS translation: 趣中隨下中上品。受傍生餓鬼那落迦. See also PRADHAN's note at AS, p. 54, n. 10.

[130] It is unfortunate that the ASBh does not present more detailed explanations here. What is it that makes an action mild, strong or excessive? • The order "mild unwholesome deeds: animal; middling: *preta*" is remarkable, as the common hierarchical arrangement in Buddhism is hells < animals < *pretas*. See LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Morale*, p. 5, n. 3, or AS 36,6 (=$AS_{t,P}$ 86b).

[131] For *niṣyandaphala*, KRITZER ("Additional Leaf") proposes the rendering "concordant result"; LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (*Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 185): "fruit d'écoulement"; RYŌSE (*Abhidharmahṛdaya*, p. 65) "down-flow effect"; BAREAU ("Abhidharmakośakārikā", s.v. *niṣyandaphala*): "flowing down, i.e. the necessary consequence". My translation "Concordant fruit" emphasizes similarity, as expressed in the definition of *niṣyandaphala* in AKBh 95,18 (AK II.57c): *niṣyando hetusadṛś[aḥ]*. • The Tibetan equivalent "a fruit in accordance with the cause" (*rgyu mthun pa'i 'bras bu*) stresses the aspect of similarity. The Chinese "fruit of similar stream" (等流果) expresses both similarity and the stream metaphor, as implied in the Sanskrit word Skt. *niṣyanda* (from the root /*syand*, "flow", "stream"). Also the *Śalistambasūtra* teaches that a result can be similar to its cause in the context of origination in dependence. See SCHOENING, *Śalistambasūtra*, p. 287 and FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 52. • Retaliation is certainly a connotation of this concept of *niṣyandaphala*, but the concept of reciprocity is not very detailed here. For killing a goat, for example, the culprit will neither have to be reborn as a goat to be slaughtered, nor will his death necessarily be unnatural. On the issue of reciprocity, see LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Morale*, p. 204, SCHMITHAUSEN, "Buddhismus und Natur", p. 115f., and MUMFORD, *Himalayan Dialogue*, p. 33f. The main intent here seems to be the explanation of human inequalities by means of *karman*, both as a proof of *karman*, and as a moral instruction (That Abhidharma doctrines aim at a proof of Buddhist doctrines and at the establishment of moral values can be shown in many instances throughout the written sources. I am anyhow not aware of any instance where they deliberately discourage an improvement of living conditions as one could suspect in this context. That the welfare of the clergy is placed above the welfare of mundane beings is a slightly different problem.).Various aspects of the concordant fruit have been discussed by Herbert V. GUENTHER (*Jewel Ornament*, pp. 85-88, n. 8). • While the *niṣyandaphala*s for the first seven kinds of action (bodily and verbal) are to some extent reciprocal, the three mental actions bring about a kind of habit formation as their *niṣyandaphala*. The parallel in AN IV, p. 247 contains an explanation of results within the human realm, i.e. corresponding to what in called *niṣyandaphala* in Abhidharma literature. Now, it is noteworthy that only the first seven kinds of unwholesome paths of action are explained in that AN passage, while no mention is made of the three mental acts (to the same effect: MN I, p. 345). The sevenfold list appears in descriptions of the virtuous monks, focusing, as mentioned above, more on outward behaviour (see, for example MN I, p. 179f., referred to in Frauwallner, *Geschichte*, vol. 1, pp. 105-107), while mental comportment is described elsewhere. The three *niṣyandaphala*s of mental action could therefore be a later addition. • Some treatises distinguish two kinds of concordant fruit, e.g. AS-Bu-ston, p. 525,2-4, AS-'Jam-dbyangs, pp. 179,5-180,2). I present the explanation from the *mDo kun las btus pa'i bshad pa rin po che snang ba* (ACIP TD 3935, fol. 260a): "As for the concordant fruit, there are two, because [there are 1. the concordant fruit that consists in] doing, and [2. the concordant fruit that consists in] experiencing." (*rgyu mthun pa'i 'bras bu ni byed pa dang / myong ba'i dbang gis rnam pa gnyis so //*). BLO BZANG 'PRIN LAS RNAM RGYAL (ACIP S0044, fol. 33ab) explains the concordant fruit that consists in doing: "Even if one is born in the pleasant realms (*bde 'gro*), one takes delight in the unwholesome and its

performance (*bde 'gror skyes kyang mi dge ba de dang de byed pa la dga' zhing goms pa*)", and the concordant fruit that consists in experiencing: "Through killing, even if one is born in the pleasant realms, one has become someone who is short-lived, etc., and through stealing one becomes poor in belongings, etc. (*srog gcod kyis bde 'gror skyes kyang tshe thung ba sogs dang / ma byin len gyis longs spyod dbul ba sogs su 'gyur ro //*)." MI PHAM uses a different phrasing for the concordant fruit that consists in experiencing: "Wishing to do the sins that one does [in the present life] also in later lifetimes due to the power of one's previous habit (*sdig pa gang byed de tshe rabs phyi ma rnams su sngar goms pa'i dbang gis yang byed 'dod pa*, MI PHAM, *mKhas 'jug*. p. 194)." See also GUENTHER, *Jewel Ornament*, p. 85. (See also my notes on determinism in the introduction.) • Note that the above Tibetan commentaries do not limit the concordant fruit to the human realm, in contrast to the wording of the ASVy and AKBh. RDZA DPAL SPRUL (*Kun bzang bla ma'i zhal lung*, p. 93) even states that the beings in the *sañjīva* hell kill each other in concordance with the hatred that has brought them there (*de dag 'phen byed shes sdang gi las kyis 'phangs pas / de'i byed pa rgyu mthun las* ...).

132 For the reconstruction of the Sanskrit sentence, cf. also ASBh 66,2 (additional leaf).

133 My equivalent "sovereign fruit" is an attempt to render both metaphors, *adhipati* and *phala*. BAREAU ("Abhidharmakośakārikā", s.v. *adhipatiphala*) translates *adhipateḥ phalam* (AK II.58) "fruit of the sovereign". See also LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 185: "fruit de souverain", and COX, *Disputed Dharmas*, p. 236: "sovereign effect." On *adhipati*, see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 564f., n. 253 (see also CPD, s.v.: 1. ruler, master, owner, 2. a controller, dominant factor). In fact, *adhipatiphala* has been described as "a kind of by-effect" by SCHMITHAUSEN (*Ālayavijñāna*, p. 397, n. 672). In the same vein, KRITZER (*Rebirth and Causation*, p. 83) proposes the rendering "subordinate result" (but cf. *ibid.*, p. 23: "influencing condition", *adhipatipratyaya*), or id. ("Additional Leaf") "secondary result". The latter would be equally appropriate for *niṣyandaphala*. In the elaborate Abhidharma theory of causation, the main cause for an *adhipatiphala* is an *adhipratyaya*, a controlling or dominating factor (see, e.g., SWTF, s.v.).

134 Above the *daṇḍa* that follows *evamādi* / (corresponding to ASBh 65,6) in ASBh$_{MS}$, a kind of dot is visible. KRITZER ("Additional Leaf") has identified this "faint smudge" as an indication where the text of the additional leaf belongs.

135 Originally, *yathāsūtram* was intended to introduce the statement about the three results of wholesome action (AS 54,6-7). I have split the AS phrase in accordance with ASVy$_c$ 728a26, 728b10. Note that ASVy$_{t,P}$ 241b7 considers the AS explanation of the *adhipatiphala* of unwholesome actions to be the content of the *sūtra* reference (*'di lta ste / ... ji ltar bshad do /*). • An equivalent to ASBh *yathāsūtram* is missing in ASVy$_{t,P}$. ASVy$_c$: 如經言; AS$_{t,P}$ 102a1: *de yang mdo las ji skad du*; AS$_c$ 679a26: 廣說如經.

136 Cf. LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (*Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 186): "développé".

137 ASVy$_c$ 728a27 reads "in hell, [among] animals, [among] pretas" (於那落迦傍生餓鬼). XUANZANG probably added "among animals and pretas" (missing also in AKBh$_{c,X}$,

but contained in *Mahāvibhāṣā* 588c10) for the sake of consistency with the previous explanations. Here, he follows the common hierarchical arrangement hells > animals > pretas. Cf. ASBh 65,1-2.

[138] Cf. AKBh 253,24: *sarvair eva*; LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (*Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 186): "*chaque*". Note that there is no equivalent for *sarvair eva* in $AKBh_t$. *sarva*

[139] It is difficult to identify those three participles in both of XUANZANG's translations. They are clearly visible in $AKBh_{c,X}$.

[140] $AKBh_{c,X}$, "[he] experiences the concordant fruit" (受等流果), seems to be an addition by XUANZANG.

[141] $ASBh_{T,MS}$ and SAKUMA (*Index*, p. 181) all read *icchatvam*. YBh_{MS} *icchaṃtvam* (cf. YBh 184, n. 1). The $AKBh_{MS}$ reads *icchatva* or *icchaṃtva* (*anusvāra* not clearly visible). SENART, ed., *Mahāvastu* reads *icchatvam* in four cases: vol. 1, p. 52, lines 7 and 8, p. 338,18, vol. 2, p. 133,4, in one *itthatvam*: vol. 3, p. 447,8 (all five cases allegedly in accordance with all MSS). ▪ In his AKBh edition, PRADHAN opted for *itthaṃtvam*, followed by HIRAKAWA (AKBh-Index-Skt, p. 476) and FUNAHASHI (*Gōbon*, p. 402). JAINI (*Abhidharmadīpa* 177,8) reads *itthatvam* (I have not consulted the MS of the *Abhidharmadīpa*). Cf. also BHSD (s.v. *icchatva* and *itthatva*), and *Critical Pāli Dictionary* (s.v. *itthatta*).

[142] *Abhidharmadīpa* 177,8 reads *alpāyuṣko*. There are several of such minor differences in nominal affixes, etc. in this section on the three kinds of fruit. Also YBh 184,1: *alpāyuṣko*. ● Although there is some discussion about short life being the result of killing, that doctrine is absolutely in agreement with the *Cūḷakammavibhaṅgasutta* (*appāyukasaṃvattanikā esā māṇava paṭipadā / yadidaṃ pāṇtipātī hoti* ..., MN III, p. 203,23f.). See also T78, 887c20-22: 人於世間喜殺生無慈心者。死入地獄中。地獄中罪竟復爲人。即不壽. ● The issue of short life is discussed in AKBh 254,5-7 (at the end of the *niḥṣyandaphala* section): "Even a short life among humans is the fruit of wholesome [action]. How, then, [can it be established as] the concordant fruit of killing? It is not said [in the sūtra] that exactly that [human] life is the result of that (i.e. killing). Rather, [it is said in the sūtra:] "Through that (i.e. killing) one becomes short-lived". It has to be understood [as follows]: Therefore, killing is a cause for the interrupting (*antarāya*) of that life. (*alpam apy āyur manuṣyeṣu kuśalaphalam / tat kathaṃ prāṇātipātasya niḥṣyandaphalaṃ bhavati / nocyate tad evāyus tasya phalam / kiṃ tarhi / tenālpāyur bhavatīti / ato 'ntarāyahetuḥ prāṇātipātas tasyāyuṣo bhavatīti veditavyam /*). I assume the problem here lies simply within the ambiguity of the word *āyus*, i.e. whether it refers to life as a whole (including the realm where one is born), or only to the life span (or life expectancy) of a living being. While Vasubandhu at AKBh 74,3-5 quite clearly presumes *āyus* (equivalent to *jīvitendriya*) to determine the duration of life exclusively, a corresponding explanation in the *Viniścayasaṃgrahaṇī* is not without ambiguity, in so far as it mentions both, the realm of existence and the duration of life: "What is the life faculty (*jīvitendriya*)? That which has projected (*'phangs pa*) a definite time of remaining [for the one who has] actualized a body (*lus*, Skt. probably "existence", **ātmabhāva*) here or there (*de dang der*, i.e. in a specific *gati*) based on one's previous actions (*srog gi*

dbang po gang zhe na / sngon gyi las kyis de dang der lus mngon par grub pa gnas pa'i dus nges pa 'phangs pa, $YBh_{t,P}$ *zi* 25b-2-3, see also KRITZER, *Vasubandhu*, p. 69)." The same doctrine is explained in more detail at AS 11,4f., clearly focussing on the predetermined (*niyama*) *duration* of life, but also taking the realm of existence into account (*jīvitendriyaṃ katamat / nikāyasabhāge pūrvākarmaviddhe sthitikālaniyame āyur iti prajñaptiḥ /*). On *āyus,* see also my discussion of *ākṣepaka* and *paripūraka* ad AS 54,11-12. For a very similar concept of *āyus* in the *Yogabhāṣya*, see POTTER, "Karma Theory", p. 244. ▪ BU STON, although well acquainted with the AKBh, does not address the issue, but rather laconically states "through killing, the concordant fruit is [having] a short life" (*bsad pas rgyu mthun tshe thung*, AS-Bu-ston , p. 525,1). He also adduces some quotations from other texts, none of which questions the doctrine of short life through killing. To the same effect AS-'Jam-dbyangs, p. 179,5: *myong ba'i rgyu mthung ni gal te ngan song nas mir skyes na yang tshe thung ba dang nor dang khyim thab dman pa la sogs pa*, and AS-'Jam-dbyangs, p. 180,5: *srog gcod spangs pas tshe ring ba*. Even for Vasubandhu, I assume, the issue would not have arisen if there was some kind of "negative life span". Unfortunately, a minus in life span can only be expressed as "short" in the sense of a less than average life expectancy, while a plus is "long" in the sense of more than average. At this point, one may wonder whether killing may favour a human rebirth on a continent or in an era where the average human life expectancy is relatively short. ▪ That idea *might* have been the intention behind the theory that a short life-span is actually not a *niṣyandaphala* but an *adhipatiphala* (see KRITZER, *Vasubandhu*, p. 267). Otherwise I can make no sense of it. Plants are *alpaujasaḥ* as the *adhipatiphala* of killing (AKBh 254,7f.), not *alpāyuṣaḥ*, and even though human *āyus* may decrease due to a decrease in the *ojas* of nutrition, I do not think this is meant here. ▪ What about the life-span of a long-lived god (see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 525, n. 153)? In the context of the *niṣyandaphala*, the ASVy here speaks of the human realm only. Even though that is probably not meant as a strict dogma, the life-span of a god was most likely considered neither *adhipatiphala* nor *niṣyandaphala*, but rather a part of the *deva* package one acquires as a *vipākaphala* of one's wholesome *karman,* or, in other terms, as the determined life span one acquires in accordance with the group (*nikāya*) one is born into (AS 11,6). Even though *vipākaphala* tends to describe the individual aspects of karmic retribution, and not its environmental, or shared aspects, there are surely many cases where the two overlap. One's individual life-span is one of those instances where the differentiation between *vipākaphala, niṣyandaphala* and *adhipatiphala* is not self-evident, especially for one who is born in a species with a commonly determined life-span. And, that threefold differentiation was probably unknown to the authors of the *Cūḷakammavibhaṅgasutta*. • KRITZER ("Additional Leaf", p. 474) suggests that this explanation was not included in the ASVy because it was an unessential remark by Vasubandhu ("Vasubandhu's personal aside"). • According to HALBFASS (*Karma und Wiedergeburt*, p. 81f.), *āyuḥkarman* is in Jainism a separate category of *karman*, the "amount of life" (HALBFASS: "eine biologische 'Lebensmenge' bzw. ein Vitalitätspotential") at one's disposal. *Āyuḥkarman* also determines the realm of rebirth (*gati*), but if I were to judge from its name, that interpretation of *āyuḥkarman* seems secondary. • The question in how far *karman* influences the life span is also discussed in the *Kathāvatthu*. See HALBFASS, *Karma und Wiedergeburt*, p. 114f. • To the AKBh

explanation "[having a] short life", SAEKI (*Kandō*, scroll 17, p. 8a) glosses "or often ill (lit. 'many diseases')" (或多病). In the *Cūḷakammavibhaṅgasutta* (MN, no. 135), poor health is the result of injuring living beings, which is not one of the classical ten unwholesome paths of action, and therefore not discussed in our ASVy passage. Cf. **Mahāvibhāṣā* 588c11: "[having] many diseases and a short life" (多病短命).

[143] At $ASVy_{t,P}$ 241b8, *bhogavyasanī* is interpreted as "addicted to wealth" (*longs spyod la chags pa*) against "poor" in the other translations of ASVy and AKBh. According to BÖHTLINGK and ROTH, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung*, s.v. *vyasanin*, can mean both "passionately addicted to" and "unhappy, having an accident", but also "struggling for." The expression 匱乏 in **Mahāvibhāṣā* 588c15 (財寶匱乏, identical to $AKBh_{c,X}$) means "lack, shortage", esp. of food. Also Paramārtha's 財物障難 indicates some kind of impediment or hardship. "Addicted to wealth" (*longs spyod la chags pa*) would be a negative character trait, in that way similar to violent passion (*tīvrarāga*), the *niṣyandaphala* of covetousness. • YBh 184,2: Although the YBh MS reads *bhogavyasanī*, BHATTACARYA has included his own reconstruction for YBh_t *longs spyod kyis phongs par 'gyur ba dang*: *[sambhogavipanno bhavati]*.

[144] This formulation again shows that males are the main focus of attention, be it as audience or be it as the normal form of human existence. • "Having an unfaithful wife" (*sasapatnadārah*) would be in a more literal translation "[a man who has] a wife (*dāra*) who has (*sa*) a rival (*sapatna*)", as reflected in the $AKBh_t$ *dgra dang bcas pa'i chung ma can* (also AS-Bu-ston, p. 525,3: *dgra bcas kyi chung ma can*). $ASVy_t$ translates *'bad pa dang bcas pa* ("having effort"), as if reading *sayatna*. Semantically, this interpretation makes sense, albeit a different one than the original ASVy sentence. ▪ The repetition of *sa* is found in the AKBh and AKVy but omitted in the *Abhidharmadīpa* (I have consulted neither MS). The editors of both AKBh (PRADHAN) and AKVy (WOGIHARA) have chosen to separate *sa* as if it was a personal pronoun. HIRAKAWA (AKBh-Index-Skt, p. 375) reads *sapatnadārah* (Tib. *dgra dang bcas pa'i chung ma can*), omitting the first *sa*, and there is no mention of his emendation (for *sampanna*°) in the corrigenda (*ibid.*, p. 476). FUNAHASHI (*Gōbon*, p. 410, n. 12) explicitly states that WOGIHARA's *sa sapatna* is a mistake for *sasapatna*. ▪ It is also noteworthy that both the $AKBh_{MS}$ and the added leaf seem to contain the same misspelling, i.e. *sasampannadārah* for *sasapatnadārah*. This could mean that the reading of $ASVy_t$ (misreading *sasapatna* as *sa sayatna*) is based on another MS–either originally, or miscorrected by NYI MA RGYAL MTSHAN. Also $AKBh_t$ presupposes *sasapatna*, which means that it possibly derives from another MS than the one available. PRADHAN, in his edition of the AKBh, preferred *sampannadārah*. Can we take a Freudian mistake into consideration for that reading, meaning "As a result of his adultery, he will have a perfect wife (i.e. mistress)"? Cf. KRITZER ("Additional Leaf"). • Much easier to understand is AN IV, p. 247: *sapattaverasaṃvattaniko hoti* ("being then someone involved with the hostility of one's rivals"). The discourse being addressed to monks, there is no mention of a wife. • **Mahāvibhāṣā* 588c19 (妻不貞良) is identical to $AKBh_{c,X}$. • YBh 184,2: BHATTACARYA reads *aguptadvāro* ("[having] an unprotected door") in accordance with the YBh MS, while the Tibetan translation (*chung ma ma bsrungs par 'gyur ba*, $YBh_{t,D}$ *zi* 92b7) seems to presuppose *aguptadāro* ("[having] a wife

who is unprotected"). Semantically, the two need not make a difference, but the variety of interpretations of this term is noteworthy. It is almost as enigmatic as *sasapatnadāra* in the ASVy/AKBh. • TATIA's footnote (ASBh 65, n. 7) refers to the wrong page number in the *Abhidharmadīpa*, i.e. 179 instead of 177.

[145] Cf. LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (*Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 186): "il est calomnié". • **Mahāvibhāṣā* 588c22 (多遭誹謗) is identical to $AKBh_{c,X}$.

[146] SAEKI (*Kandō*, scroll 17, p. 8b) glosses the very rare term 乖穆 as "separation", based on the **Mahāvibhāṣā* (離–婆沙). See below. • YBh 184,3: *vibhinnamitra*. • *Abhidharmadīpa* 177,10: "Because of slander, he will not have close (or steady, *dṛdha*) friends" (*paiśunyenādṛdhamitra*). • **Mahāvibhāṣā* 588c25-26 (親友乖離) is identical to $ASVy_c$ 728b1. • Cf. WALTERS, "Buddha's Bad Karma", p. 85: "[Munāli/Buddha] because of that karma, roasted in hell for many thousands of years. As the remaining effect of that karma now, even though he was the Buddha, he received slander because of Sundarī."

[147] Skt. *śabda* means either sound, voice, or speech, words, similar to its Tibetan equivalent *sgra*. Chin. 聲 predominantly means "voice" but it can also stand for "reputation". As this section on the concordant fruit mostly describes effects in interpersonal relationships, I opt to translate *śabda* as "words", quite surely implying blame or swearing. Based on the Tibetan and Chinese versions of the AKBh, LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (*Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 186) reconstructs *amanāpaśravaṇa* and translates this as "il n'entend que des discours odieux", i.e. words that are unpleasant. This is just one of the many occasions where I am indebted to Iain SINCLAIR for his valuable remarks! • To the same effect, **Mahāvibhāṣā* 588c29-589a1 (恒聞種種不如意聲). • Note that at $YBh_{t,D}$ *tshi* 93a1-b2 unpleasant sounds/voices (*yid du mi 'ong ba'i sgra*) as the concordant result of harsh words stand in contrast to unmelodious words (*tshig mi snyan pa*) as the result of idle prattle.

[148] XUANZANG uses two different equivalents for *saṃbhinnapralāpa*: $ASVy_c$ 727b13 雜穢語 and $AKBh_{c,X}$ 綺語. The latter is the one found in YBh-Index-CST. Cf. NAGAO, ed., *Index to Asaṅga's Mahāyānasaṃgraha*, p. xi. "The translation of doctrinal technical terms [...] has been standardized to a high degree, and the lack of adaptation of a term to the context is one of the hallmarks of Hsüan-tsang's style." It seems that 雜穢語 here is an exception to that rule (another one has been pointed out by SILK, "The Yogācāra Bhikṣu", p. 272 in the case of the term *yogācāra*).

[149] Cf. LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (*Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 186): "sa parole n'obtient pas créance." • The rendering of $ASVy_t$ *ngag cal col* (lit. "noisy speech", which seems to mean "babble, blab") resembles that of YBh_t *mi snyan pa* ("disagreeable", "crude"). • **Mahāvibhāṣā* 589a5 (言不威肅) is identical to $AKBh_{c,X}$ and $ASVy_c$ 728b2.

[150] YBh 184,4 *tīvrarogo* (should read *tīvrarāgo*). • **Mahāvibhāṣā* 589a9: 貪欲猛利. • I translate *rāga* as "passion" in accordance with DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 479, n. 38 and CPD, s.v. *arāga*. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish *rāga* from *kāma* (on which see DELEANU, *op.cit.*, p. 475, n. 23), and the Tibetan equivalent for *rāga* (*'dod chags*, see

MaVyu 1944, 2132) is at times used for *kāma* or *lobha* as well. See also AHN (*Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 32): "leidenschaftliche[s] Verlangen nach Sinnensgenüssen" (*kāmarāga*).

[151] **Mahāvibhāṣā* 589a12-13: 瞋恚猛利.

[152] **Mahāvibhāṣā* 589a16: 愚癡猛利.

[153] The explanation *tasyā mohabhūyastvāt* is missing in both *Abhidharmadīpa* and YBh, but found in the AKBh (see also SAEKI, *Kandō*, scroll 17, p. 8b, LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 186). Saṃghabhadra criticises that phrase in his commentaries, discussing the relation between delusion (*moha*) and wrong view, and stating that violent delusion cannot be the *niṣyandaphala* of wrong view. Time does not permit me to consult the original sources, so I would like to refer the reader to KRITZER, "Additional Leaf", pp. 475-477, for a rendering and interpretation of the arguments. ▪ The *Cūḷakammavibhaṅgasutta* (MN, no. 135), as said above, neither uses the classical list of the ten paths of action nor does it name and discuss the three kinds of fruit systematically. Nonetheless, at the end of its analysis of various wholesome and unwholesome actions, the last action to be analysed is that of a man or woman, who never approaches a recluse (*samaṇa*) or a *brāhman* and thus never asks them about what is wholesome or unwholesome, what is to be done and not to be done, etc. Should such a person be reborn as a human (*sace manussattaṃ āgacchati*), he or she will, as the result of that failure, have poor insight, a bad intellect (*duppañña*). On the other hand, the result of approaching religious teachers and enquiring about what is wholesome and unwholesome, is having great insight (*mahāpañña*). The failure of not knowing about the good and bad results of actions is also mentioned at AS 55,1-2 (explanation at ASBh 66,16-18). It is one of the two kinds of being bewildered (**saṃmūḍha*) which are used to explain the phrase "ignorance is the condition the impulses" in the *pratītyasamutpāda* formula. According to the ASBh, that "being bewildered with regard to the ripening of the fruit" (*phalavipākasaṃmūḍha*) brings about defiled (*kliṣṭa*) impulses (*saṃskārāḥ*) that are somehow opposed to the right view (*samyagdṛṣṭi*). I fail to fully grasp the argument of ASBh 66,16-18 due to its complicated phrasing: the causal relationship between being bewildered with regard to the ripening of the fruit (*phalavipākasaṃmūḍha*) and right view (*samyagdṛṣṭi*) is not explained but presupposed and only vaguely alluded to. That in turn leads me to suspect that the ASBh author tried to avoid all too definite statements about the relation between ignorance, bewilderment, and right (or wrong) views, not to mention delusion (*moha*). He was probably aware that the issue is controversial. A little further below (ASBh 66,23-25), we find the explanation of killing out of delusion (*mohena*). The example there is a sacrificial priest (*yājñika*) who practices animal (or human?) sacrifice. Now, though it can be safely said that animal sacrifice does not result from dullness only, but from a full-fledged religious ideology, AKBh 240,21-22 nonetheless presents sacrificial slaughter as a form of killing that arises from delusion (*mohaja*), which opens a section in which various doctrines that justify killing are discussed. At the end of that section, AKBh 241,1 states: "And what [has been said above is] killing which evolves from wrong views (*yaś ca mithyādṛṣṭipravartitaḥ prāṇatipātaḥ*)." It is thus clear that, although wrong view can be considered a form of insight (see KRITZER, "Additional Leaf", p. 475), there is an abundance of passages in

Abhidharma literature where wrong view is *not* antithetical to delusion. I therefore agree with JAINI ("*Prajñā* and *dṛṣṭi*", p. 408), who states that in the Vaibhāṣika system "any instance of *avidyā* and *prajñā* coexisting in the same mind-moment must involve only *kuprajñā*, i.e. *dṛṣṭi*, for this factor is *not* antithetical to *avidyā*". That in turn directly contradicts KRITZER's ("Additional Leaf", p. 475) statement that "Mithyādṛṣṭi [...] is technically an impure type of prajñā, which is antithetical to avidyā (see Jaini 2001)." With Jaini, I believe that someone in a state of *moha* can be able to think sharply and draw correct inferences based on wrong presuppositions. MAYRHOFER's (*Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, s.v. *muhyati*) equivalents for *moha* ("Irrewerden, Wahn, Verwirrung") resemble the state of "delusion" as it is understood in contemporary psychiatry (see *Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, s.v.). As stated above, time does not permit me to analyze Saṃghabhadra's arguments, but the issue of delusion and ignorance in *karman* doctrine is systematically a tricky one: All unawakened beings are constantly and fundamentally deluded, ignorant as to the true nature of themselves. That fundamental ignorance is not always easy to differentiate from wrong views (as in the case of *māna*, on which see TAKASAKI, *Introduction to Buddhism*, p. 147). If, now, that ignorance had a negative karmic effect, this would result in a downward spiral, leading to an ever increasing entanglement in *saṃsāra*, a constantly growing mass of *duḥkha*. It is, I think, for the same reason that various other mental factors were classified as *nivṛta-avyākṛta* ("shrouded and undetermined"), a mild category without the far-reaching implications of *akuśala*. See also DELHEY, *Samāhitā Bhūmiḥ*, p. 47, referring to AS 23,2f. and AS 21,1f.

154 *Abhidharmadīpa* 177,14: *alpaujaskā*. • YBh 184,7: *alpaujaskaphalā*. • **Mahāvibhāṣā* 588c12: 所感外物皆少光澤不久堅住 ("... and they do not remain for a long time"). • The term *ojas* (which mainly means "vigour", "vitality", but also "splendour, lustre") has been variously translated as *gzi mthu* ($AKBh_{t,D}$), *snum bag* ($ASVy_{t,P}$), 光澤 ($ASVy_c$ and $AKBh_{c,X}$), 勢味 ($AKBh_{c,X}$). AKVy 418,25 explains it as *vīryā[ḥ]* (in the end of a plural masculine bahuvrīhi). Also humans have this "vigour", believed to be located in (or originate from) the region of the heart (*ojo hṛdayapradeśe bhavati*, AKVy 419,22. According to WOGIHARA, AKVy 419, n. 2, the MSS read *hṛdayapadeśe*.). • NĀRADA MAHĀ THERA (*Manual of Abhidhamma*, p. 301, n. 51) notes: "The growth of inanimate matter is also due to the presence of this universal Ojā." *Ojā* is translated (without any further explanations) as "nutritive essence" in BHIKKHU BODHI, ed., *Comprehensive Manual of Abhidhamma*, p. 246. NYANATILOKA, *Buddhist Dictionary*, s.v. *ojā*: "nutriment" (see also the entry *rūpa-kalāpa*). For the time being, I assume animistic connotations to this concept of *ojas*, wherefore I cannot wholly agree with the formulations "inanimate matter", "nutritive essence" or "nutriment" in the preceding sources. Cf. BHSD, s.v. *ojā*: "It seems clear that in BHS, at least, ojā means simply *food*, not *essence* or the like." Edgerton was nonetheless aware that *ojas* means "strength" (see BHSD, s.v. *-ojaska*). See also CPD (s.v. *ojas*, *ojā*). • LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (*Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 187) adds "les plantes, le sol, etc. [...] sont de petite vitalité". • At least in the sense of a basic vitality, *ojas* overlaps with the Vaiśeṣika concept of *adṛṣṭa*, which, among others, causes the circulation of sap in trees. See HALBFASS (*Karma und Wiedergeburt*, pp. 133-139).

---

[155] Because of the particle *la*, which to my knowledge does not go with *bsten*, I consider *la brten* (ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$) a mistake of the translator, possibly based on a misspelled version of AKBh$_t$. Therefore, I leave it uncorrected in my edition. As DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 386, n. 446) points out, the reading *brten* (or, *la brten*) often occurs in the canons for Sanskrit words based the root /*sev*. D preferably reads *bsten* where P often has *brten*. Still, the passage edited by DELEANU contains the particle *la* and all versions including D read *la brten* (see also *ibid.*, p. 362, n. 64). It therefore seems that the D reading *bsten* for *brten* is often a later correction, but the D editors did not go so far as to change *la brten* to either *bsten* or the completely wrong reading **la bsten*. DELEANU proposes provisionally treating *brten* as a legitimate alternative reading for *bsten*. Also NEGI (*Tibetan-Sanskrit*, s.v. *brten pa*) list *brten* and *la brten* among the equivalents for words belonging to the root /*sev*. My own old-school assumption is that /*sev* or anything with the meaning "to serve, to wait upon" is properly rendered only by *bsnyen* and *bsten*, while *brten* should be used for /*śri* or anything with the meaning "to rest upon, to rely upon", normally requiring the particle *la* (See, e.g., SAKUMA, *Āśrayaparivṛtti*, vol. 2, pp. 8, 41: ŚrBh 196,12 *āsevana*; SrBh$_{t,PNDC}$ *kun du bsten*, or ISHIHAMA and FUKUDA, *Mahāvyutpatti*, ad MaVyu 1778: *sevanam*; ‹*bsten* / *brten* L / **bsnyen* C› *pa*, ad MaVyu 1783: *upasevanam*; *nye bar bsten pa*, ad MaVyu 2320: *āsevitam*; ‹*bsten* DCL / *brten* PN› *pa'am* ‹*bsnyen* / *bsten* L› *pa*. "L" here stands for the "Leningrad MS" of the *Mahāvyutpatti*.). One could then explain the frequent misreading *brten* (for words related to /*sev*) as something that occurred while the texts were still transmitted in the *dbu med* script, where a *sa* between *ba* and *ta* was not easily distinguishable from a *ra* (One argument in support of the thesis that *rten* for /*sev* is simply wrong is the reading *ston pa*, "Teacher", for *pratisaraṇa* which occurs in BoBhū$_{t,PNDC}$. See NAKAMURA, "Erwachen", p. 40.). If that was the case, some editors chose to emend to *la brten* and not to *bsten*, which opens the question why they preferred *la brten*. Although I cannot answer that question, I often observe among contemporary Tibetans conversant in English the tendency to translate *bsten* as "rely upon", which accords to JÄSCHKE (*Tibetan-English Dictionary*, s.v. *sten*). Still, that is only partly due to JÄSCHKE's influence, for one frequently finds *la bsten* [sic] in contemporary editions from the People's Republic of China. It must have been already JÄSCHKE's informants who thought that *bsten* means *brten* (See also ISHIHAMA and FUKUDA, *Mahāvyutpatti*, ad MaVyu 2508: *pāpamitratā*; *sdig pa'i grogs po* ‹*dang brten* L / *brten* PN / *bsten* DC› *pa*. Is this accurately "relying on evil company" in PN or "serving evil company" in DC?). I assume that many Tibetan scholars found it quite that *bsten* should be synonymous with *bsnyen*, but not with *brten*, and indeed it I am myself still stunned by this, even though I am quite sure that it is so. And, the semantic ranges of Sanskrit expressions like *upa-/sev* or *ā-/srī* may be very close and even overlapping when they describe the nature of a guru-disciple relationship (See, e.g., ISHIHAMA and FUKUDA, *Mahāvyutpatti*, ad MaVyu 1605: *satpuruṣāśrayam*, *skyes bu dam pa la* ‹*brten* DCL / *bsten* PN› *pa*, ad MaVyu 1781: *upāsanam*; ‹ *bsnyen bkur byed pa* -L ›.). For lack of a better solution I propose reading *bsten* for /*sev* if one version (P, N, G, D, C) supports it, and only otherwise considering *brten* a mistake above all versions, even though I suppose that many of the DC readings *bsten* go back to the Sanskrit expertise of the D editors and are thus secondary. I just see no way to prove that in every single case. • Coming back to our ASVy$_t$ reading, I

unfortunately have to assume that the ASVy$_t$ revisor (probably NYI MA RGYAL MTSHAN) had *kun du bsten* or *kun du brten* before him and changed it to *la brten*–an invention that was so massive that it could not be corrected by the D editors. On *bsten pa* vs. *brten pa*, see also the remarks by DELHEY (*Samāhitā Bhumiḥ*, p. 343) ad YBh$_{t,P}$ 156a5-7. • On the euphonics of the prefix *kun du*, see SIMONSSON, *Indo-tibetische Studien*, p. 22.

[156] This term could mean just mean "thunderstorm", *rajas* here in the sense of "cloud". The explanation of AKVy 418,25 is somewhat doubtful: "**Lightning** (*aśani*) is hail. **Dust** (*rajas*) is a rain of dust or acrid (*kṣāra*) rain through which the crops and so on are destroyed" (***aśaniḥ*** *śilāvarṣam /* ***rajo*** *dhūlivṛṣṭiḥ kṣāravṛṣṭiḥ vā / yataḥ sasyādivināśaḥ*). ASVy$_{t,P}$ translates "unstable and [with] a lot of harmful [things?]"; ASVy$_c$ and AKBh$_{c,X}$ "frost and hail"; AKBh$_{c,P}$ "many thunderstorms, a lot of debris"; AKBh$_{t,P}$ "hail and rain". Based on AKVy, LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (*Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 187) translates: "elles sont accablées par des pluies de pierres, de poussière ou d'acide". The compound *aśaniraja[s]* could just generally refer to any heavy weather that brings with it lightening, dust (as in the beginning of the rainy season) or sandstorms, hail, acrid substances like ashes etc., whatever of those elements may be predominant. • *Abhidharmadīpa* 177,14f.: "[they are characterized by] small fruits, minor harvests, many thunderstorms" (*adattādanena parīttaphalā alpasasyā aśanibahulā*). • YBh 184,7-8: *asampannaphalāḥ*. • **Mahāvibhāṣā* 588c15-16: "[As for] the external things (外物) that one experiences (所感), there are (有) disasters (災), [and] there is harm (患) [that consists in] the massive occurrence (多遭) of afflictions (障) [such as] frost (霜), hail (雹, or does 霜雹 as a compound mean "hail"?), dust (塵), dirt (穢, or "organic waste"), and so on (等)" (所感外物有災有患多遭霜雹塵穢等障). See also DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, pp. 416, 449. • The Tibetan translation in ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a3 diverges strongly from the Sanskrit MS, stating that the crops will be "unstable and there will be much harm" (*mi brtan zhing nyams par byed pa mang ba*). It is much more easy to see a symbolic reference to stealing in this formulation, i.e. crops can be difficult to safeguard when there are environmental disasters, just as one's property is difficult to safeguard when there are thieves.

[157] YBh 184,8: *pūtiphalāḥ* ("having stinking [/foul] fruit"). • **Mahāvibhāṣā* 588c19-20 (misreading **raṇā* for *rajas*?): "there are many struggles" (所感外物多有怨競). • "Dust" (*rajas*, Pāli *raja*) is an important metaphor for *karman*–the Upaniṣads, in Jainism, but also in the *Udāna* and *Udānavarga*. See ENOMOTO, "Annihilation of *karman*", p. 44f. That karmic dust is equated with desire (*rāga*) in the works of Dhammapāla (*ibid.*, p. 45, n. 3). As far as I can gather from BÖHTLINGK and ROTH (*Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, s.v. *rajas*), the assonance between *rāga* and *rajas* is also alluded to in non-Buddhist literature. See also MAYRHOFER'S (*Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, s.v. *rajas*, 2) remarks on *rajyati*. It would be fair to assume that a similar imagination (sexual misconduct as dirty) plays a role in this ASVy passage, and indeed the verb used here, *ava-/kṝ*, is used in Sanskrit literature for someone who has spilled (*ava-/kṝ*) his semen (*retas*) and thus violated his vow of celibacy. See BÖHTLINGK and ROTH, *op.cit.*, s.v. *avakīrṇin*, and MAYRHOFER, *op.cit.*, s.v. KAR, I.2. That strong use of "spilling" need not be alluded to here, but there is at least a possibilty that it was know to the authors of this ASVy passage. • Metaphors of dirtiness vs. purity in observing discipline can be found, for example, at ASBh 70,17-18, 21-23, or

ASBh 72,1-2.

[158] According to JÄSCHKE (*Tibetan-English*) *nga ba* (s.v.), uses in AKBh$_{t,P}$ is a variant of *ngan pa* ("bad"). • YBh 184,8 (*parivṛttaphalāḥ*) might indicate some kind of mutation ("having twisted fruit"), or that one plant carries the fruit of another (?). The latter would be parallel to the explanation of lying, i.e. another fact in the place of the accurate one. • **Mahāvibhāṣā* 588c19-20: 所感外物多諸臭穢, similar to AKBh$_c$ and ASVy$_c$ 728b7: 妄(ASVy$_c$ 妄; ASVy$_{c,宋,元,明,宮}$ eds. 虛誑)語故多諸臭穢). • Cf. SGAM PO PA, *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 57: *kha dri mi zhim pa*. Even though GUENTHER's (*Jewel Ornament*, p. 76) understanding as "halitosis" seems strange, I, too, can make no other sense of it.

[159] Uneven land is disadvantageous for agriculture, but also for herding, travelling, building, etc. • The translator(s) of ASVy$_t$ (which reads *kha ba*, bitter, here) seem to have mixed up this explanation with that of "harmful intent" (ASVy = ASBh$_T$ 65,19), where "bitter fruits" (*kaṭukaphalāḥ*) result. On that occasion, AKBh$_t$ uses the equivalent *kha ba*, while ASVy$_t$, having used *kha ba* before, reverts to *ro tsha ba* ("hot taste"). ASBh$_t$ mentions "uneven" (*mtho dman can*) in the following sentence, the explanation of "harsh speech". • ASVy$_c$ 728b7: "it is uneven [and] precipitous" (高下險阻). • YBh 184,8: *śīrṇaphalāḥ* ("rotten", or "slim"?). • **Mahāvibhāṣā* 588c26f.: 所感外物多不平正丘陵坑坎嶮阻懸隔 (i.e. uneven, [with] hills, holes in the ground, precipices, clefts).

[160] Philologically, AKBh$_t$ *tha chad* (minor, poor) is the preferable equivalent for *pratikruṣṭa*. ASVy$_t$ *rtsub pa* (rough, harsh), on the other hand, is a more overt allusion to *tshig rtsub* (harsh words).

[161] LA VALLÉE POUSSIN's (*Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 187) interpretation of Tib. *gyi sar* (Skt. °*bhūmayaḥ*) is: "elles sont impregnées de sel et stériles (*ūṣarajaṅgalā*) — il s'agit des terres, du sol — elles sont détestables (*viprakruṣṭāḥ=vigarhita*) et pernicieuses (*pāpika*) — it s'agit des plantes". Cf. AKBh$_{c,X}$: "[On] the fields (田) there are many thorny plants (多荆棘), [the fields] are rocky (磽确), salty (鹹鹵), and the harvests (lit. sowing and harvesting) are not good (稼穡匪宜). • ASVy$_{t,P}$ *sdig pa can* for *pāpabhūmayaḥ* could be a corruption of **sa sdig pa can*. • *Abhidharmadīpa* 177,16-17: "unpleasant to touch, very thorny (?)" (*duḥsparśāḥ kaṇḍukaprāyāś ca*). • YBh 184,8: *asvāduphalā[ḥ]* ("having tasteless fruit"). Is the image here "bad words come out of the mouth so the food tastes bad in the mouth"? • **Mahāvibhāṣā* 589a1-3: 感外物麁弊鄙惡毒刺沙礫雖有金等少而無光不調難用, i.e. bad (麁弊), bad soil (鄙惡), poisonous (毒), thorny (刺, or "with poisonous thorns"?), gravel (沙礫); even is there is gold or the like, it is only little an not shining, raw (不調) and difficult to use (難用).

[162] ASVy$_t$ has no equivalents for *ūṣarajaṅgalāḥ*. "Uneven" (*mtho dman can*) appears instead.

[163] Note that there is no equivalent for *ṛtu* in ASVy$_{t,P}$ 242a4-5. Also *Abhidharmadīpa* 177,17 omits *ṛtu*. The resulting "irregular changes" is rather pointless. • LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (*Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 187): "les saisons sont bouleversées". Cf. FUNAHASHI, *Gōbon*, p. 403: "The four seasons change irregularly (季節が不平等に変異

するものとなり)." • **Mahāvibhāṣā* 589a6: 所感外物時候乖變速疾磨滅多不成實, i.e. the seasons change irregularly, decrease fast (速疾磨滅?) and [the crops?] often do not reach completion. • YBh 184,8: *asadāphalā[ḥ]* ("not always [bearing] fruit"). • PARAMĀRTHA (AKBh$_{c,P}$) specifies that it is the four Great Elements (四大) which are changing (or even revolting, 變異) and out of balance (不平). • On *ṛtu* in the context of *karman* doctrine, see also HALBFASS, *Karma und Wiedergeburt*, p. 117. According to HALBFASS, *ṛtu* normally indicates a natural order, both in the organic and in the inorganic realm, such as aging (the physical stages of life), the change of seasons etc., and important aspect which I can, unfortunately, not render appropriately in my translation.

[164] LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (*Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 187) translates the Bahuvrīhi °*phalā[ḥ]* as "les fruits sont ..." (AKBh 254,10: *śuṣkaphala*. PRADHAN notes that the AKBh MS reads *śūṣkaphala*). • YBh 184,9 (MS): *alpaphalā[ḥ]*. BHATTACHARYA: *alpakaphalā[ḥ]*. • *Abhidharmadīpa* 177,17: *pacitaphalāḥ* (?). This should probably read *patitaphalāḥ* ("fallen fruits"). • **Mahāvibhāṣā* 589a9f.: 所感外物多分損減微細尠少 ("for the most part, they decrease, are small and few").

[165] YBh 184,9: *apathyaphalā[ḥ]* ("having unhealthy [/ indigestible] fruits"). • *Abhidharmadīpa* 177,18: *kaṭukarmaphalāḥ*. This should probably read *kaṭukaphalāḥ*. • **Mahāvibhāṣā* 589a13f.: "for the most part, they dry up and waste away; the fruits [taste] bitterly astringent" (所感外物多分枯悴果實苦澁).

[166] ASVy$_c$ 827b9 "[having] fruits with hot and bitter (?) taste" (果味辛苦). ASVy$_j$ provides hardly any clarification about the syntax of this phrase (瞋恚なるが故に果味辛苦なり). • YBh 184,9: *aphalā[ḥ]*. • *Abhidharmadīpa* 177,18: *bījād apakṛṣṭaphalā aphalā vā* ("from the seeds [come plants] that have inferior fruits or no fruits [at all]"). • **Mahāvibhāṣā* 589a17f.: 所感外物多分零落乏少花果或全無果 ("for the most part they are ruined, have miserable and few flowers and fruits, or no fruits at all").

[167] The instances of *adhipatiphala* in the respective YBh sentence (YBh 184,6-9) are grammatically attributes to *bāhyā bhāvā*, and all the ten compounds end in *phalāḥ*. In all instances where the ASVy mentions climatic or geological conditions, the YBh differs, reading, for example, *asampannaphalāḥ* ("having imperfect fruits") in contrast to ASVy *aśanirajobahulāḥ* ("having many thunderstorms and dust "). Note that the **Mahāvibhāṣā* puts some emphasis on the aspect of individual feeling here ("the external object that is experienced", 所感外物), probably for the sake of consistency with individual, non-material retribution which is basically presupposed in the case of Buddhist *karman* doctrine (see AS 61,1-2, *karmasvakāḥ*). • Many of the negative environmental factors described in this section are such that can be found in wild nature (or on bad farmland) and not on well-cultivated farmland, such as thorns, uneven ground etc. Agricultural fertility plays a huge role in this section, very much in contrast to Mahāyāna descriptions of–rather urban–pure lands, on which see SCHMITHAUSEN, *Buddhism and Nature*, p. 14f, and id., *Buddhismus und Natur*, pp. 105-107. Clearly, the Buddhist doctrine was addressed to both rural and urban population from the beginning (see, e.g. DN I, p. 60f.), but it seems that agriculture played a more central role in the society that brought fourth

the Abhidharma description, while the pure-land descriptions show more urban influences. It is also noteworthy that the ASVy only mentions *phala* in this context, without any regard for animal husbandry as such (herdsmen may only be hinted at by the terms *aurabhrika**kaukkuṭikā**dayāḥ* at AS 58,3-7, or *ghoṣa* at ASBh 71,15-17). • The idea that wholesome or unwholesome behaviour may affect the environment, especially agriculture, can already be traced in the Pāli canon (AN I, p. 159f., DN, no. 27). See SCHMITHAUSEN, "Ethics of Nature", p. 65 and nn. 190, 191. • Although this passage came to a wide circulation, the symbolism of the environmental conditions is not always easy to grasp. A more appealing formulation can be found in the 19th-century treatise *Kun bzang bla ma'i zhal lung* by RDZA DPAL SPRUL (p. 183f.): As a result of dividing people through slander, one will be born in a country with deep gorges (which are difficult to cross), as a result of useless prattle, one's crops will bear no fruit, and as a result of wrong views, there will be no places of refuge (because, one can infer, one has not taken refuge in the Three Jewels properly). • An interesting outline of such external results can be found in Sthiramati's commentary on the MSA, where he states that "by the force (*dbang gis*) of the mind of those committing evil actions, the harvest and so on will become weak (*mthu chung*) in colour, in scent, and in taste; even things like gold and so on will appear to be coal and so on" (P 5531, fol. *tsi* 171a2f., English translation by ROSPATT, *Momentariness*, p. 145, n. 322, see there for the edited Tibetan text). This explanation differs from the ASVy in two points: a.) The environmental effects are explicitly said to be influenced by mind. *Karman* is most probably intended here, but the phrasing only contains the ultimate influencing factor, mind. b.) Sthiramati does not only refer to plants and soil, but also to gold, a material that normally does not play a role in agriculture. This reflects both a more radical idealism (even a pure material as gold is subject to mind), as well as a probably more urban, or more aristocratic audience.

168 The AS here does not count the *asura*s as a distinct *gati*, which agrees to the doctrinal position of AK III.4 and AKBh 113,6, while the *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra* counts six *gati*s, in accordance with some other Mahāyāna sūtras. According to LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 3, p. 11, n. 2, the *Avataṃsakasūtra* counts six *gati*s while the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* counts sometimes five, sometimes six. See also BUESCHER, *Vijñānavāda*, p. 136, n. 1, SCHMITHAUSEN, *Sentience of Plants*, p. 81, n. 456, LAMOTTE, Histoire, p. 697f., and RAHULA, *Compendium*, p. 60. Tibetan Buddhists basically assume six *gati*s, using different explanations to align this with the five-*gati* system. See 'JU MI PHAM, *Gateway to Knowledge*, vol. 2, p. 98, and KONG SPRUL, *Myriad Worlds*, p. 128.

169 KRITZER ("Additional Leaf", p. 467) has rightly observed that an explanation of the sovereign fruit (*adhipatiphala*) is missing in the additional leaf. KRITZER speculates that this "could be well due to the scribe's oversight", but I think it more probable that it was difficult for the scribe to foresee how he could fit the explanations on exactly one folio. When he saw that he had almost reached the end of the back page, he probably decided to leave out one sentence that was contained in the AS anyhow. Moreover, that sentence was completely parallel to the previous explanation of the *adhipatiphala* of unwholesome deeds, the only difference being surely that what is wholesome leads to *saṃpatti* while what is unwholesome leads to *vipatti*. It is also remarkable that the Tibetan translation of the ASVy *contains* the sentence on the *adhipatiphala* of wholesome actions. In addition

to Tib. *'bad pa dang bcas pa* for *saṃpanna* at "ASBh 65,10", I see the *adhipatiphala* sentence as another indication (but not as sufficient evidence) that the "additional leaf" is only an excerpt from a complete ASVy MS, and that the Tibetan translation of the whole passage on the three kinds of result in the ASVy was prepared based on another MS than the "additional leaf". • I chose the translation "excellent" for Skt. *saṃpatti* as an antonym for "miserable", and in accordance with Tib. *phun sum tshogs pa*. Other possible translations are "accomplishment" or "joy, welfare". See BÖHTLINGK and ROTH, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, s.v. *saṃpatti*. On *saṃpatti*, see ROSPATT, *Momentariness*, p. 222, n. 466, and also the references in NAKAMURA, "Erwachen", p. 61, nos. 38, 39.

[170] The meaning of this complicated sentence is quite simple: The three kinds of fruit have been explained in the context of the unwholesome actions. As for the wholesome actions, the three kinds of fruit function in complete analogy, i.e. the fruit of ripening means rebirth in the upper realms, the concordant fruit influences one's body and social situation, and the sovereign fruit will bring about a desirable environment. The *Culakammavibhaṅgasutta* (MN, no. 135), in contrast, explains the various results of unwholesome and wholesome deeds in another order: first, taking of life (unwholesome), then abandonment of taking of life (wholesome), and so on, in pairs of unwholesome and wholesome (it should be noted that that sutta neither names the various categories of results as this or that fruit, those categories being the product of Abhidharma scholasticism, nor does it discuss the classical list of ten unwholesome/wholesome actions).

[171] Strikingly, $ASBh_t$ *dge ba <u>bcu'i</u> las kyi lam zag pa dang bcas pa rnams kyi* correlates to $AS_{t,P}$ 102a1 (*dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam rnams kyi*), AS_c 679a27 (十善業道) which is reflected in the ASVy ("additional leaf", *daśānāṃ kuśalānāṃ karmapathānāṃ*). Further below, the ASVy addresses the "wholesome *karman* with inflow" ($ASVy_{t,P}$ 242a8 *dge ba'i las kyi lam zag pa dang bcas pa rnams*, $ASVy_c$ 728b15 有漏善業道), without mentioning the number ten. This seems to correlate to the original ASBh reading, while $ASBh_t$ *dge ba <u>bcu'i</u> las kyi lam* is probably contaminated by the ASVy (or AS) reading. The reading *kuśalādīnāṃ karmapathānāṃ sāsravāṇāṃ* in the $ASBh_{MS}$ is obviously wrong and I think my emendation reconstructs the original ASBh reading. I think it quite probable that the $ASBh_t$ translators had this very ASBh MS at hand, or a related MS that read *kuśalādīnāṃ*. Trying to make sense of that sentence, they used an ASVy MS, but, taking the wrong sentence into account, wrongly inserted *bcu'i*. They were possibly not in the possession of a complete ASVy MS but only had the (or, an) "additional leaf", which reflected only the AS sentence (*daśānāṃ* ...) and not the (original) ASBh sentence.

[172] I render *ā-/kṣip* and its derivatives as "entail" here, even though */kṣip* clearly means "to throw, cast, direct upon", etc., even though *ā-/kṣip* primarily means "to throw, cast towards", and only secondarily "to draw away." My translation is supported by the two renderings that appear in AS_c, namely 招引 ("to call in, to draw in") here, and 牽得 ("to pull in the obtainment of ... ") below (ad 54,14-15), which means that *ā-/kṣip* is interpreted from the perspective of the point *towards* which something is thrown or cast. PAHLKE (*Vijñāna-Abschnitt des Pañcaskandhaka*, p. 95) translates *ā-/kṣip* as "programmiert" (with reference to TrBh 38,15-16, *ākṣiptapunarbhavam ... karma*). See

also Cox, *Disputed Dharmas* , p. 292: "[due to] the projected momentum of the period of abiding." • To render *ākṣepaka*, AS_t uses *'phen pa* (to throw, hurl, project). Still, as a noun, *'phen pa* can also mean "span, amount" (*tshad*), or force (*nus pa*, seemingly the propelling force here), as in *tshe'i 'phen pa*, "life span" (see KRANG DBYI SUN, ed., *Tshig mdzod chen mo*, s.v.). Tib. *tshe'i 'phen pa*, could be more literally translated as "the projecting force of life", i.e. what carries a person through a certain life span (just like an arrow is carried for a certain distance by its projecting force). • RGYAL TSAB explains *'phen pa* as "the force (*nus pa*) that projects the fruit" (*'bras bu 'phen pa'i nus pa*, AS-rGyal-tshab, p. 750,2). Same phrase in AS-Śāk, p. 211,6. • Two alternative readings at MSg I.24d present different similes for *'phen pa*: 1.) The first uses the example of an arrow that, once shot, does not fall down in the middle of its flight (*mda' ni bar du mi ltung bzhin*). Clearly, *'phen pa* is here the propelling impulse that invests the arrow with the force to fly a certain distance (even though the ballistic process is a bit more complex). Tib. *'phen pa* could also stand for Skt. *āvedha* here, in accordance with AKBh 74,5. 2.) That idea of a limited span is prevalent in the second reading "because [the body composed of the six organs] finally decays due to its own nature" (*rang gi ngang gis mthar 'jig phyir //*), a phrasing that emphasizes the end of that span. See LAMOTTE, *Somme*, vol. 2, p. 43f.

173 On the distinction between these two kinds of *karman*, see SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 136f. On the *ākṣepakahetu* as the cause for *ātmabhāvaphala*, see also KRITZER, *Rebirth and Causation*, p. 157f. Cf. also ASBh 27,19-20. On the relation between *ākṣepakahetu*, the life faculty (*jīvitendriya*) and the body, see also KRITZER, *Vasubandhu*, pp. 132-134. • RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 85, n. 3) states that the concepts of *ākṣepaka* and *paripūraka* correspond to those of *janakakamma* and *upatthambhakakamma* in Theravāda Abhidhamma: If a person is born in a wealthy (*aisée*) family, it is due to *ākṣepaka-karma* [sic] or *janakakamma*. But such a birth alone does not guarantee that one can enjoy all the benefits of such a fortunate situation. Such a result is brought forth by *paripūraka-karma* [sic] or *upatthambhakakamma* (see below, AS 54,13). The concepts of *janakakamma* and *upatthambhakakamma* are post-canonical concepts not to be found in the canonical Abhidhamma (as confirmed by the respective entries in the *Critical Pāli Dictionary* and the *Pāli Tipiṭaka Concordance*). RAHULA's explanations conform to the English annotation in NĀRADA (*Manual of Abhidhamma*, p. 257f.): There, too, *janakakamma* is that which determines the conditions of one's rebirth, while *upatthambhakakamma* brings about good or bad circumstances in one's lifetime. In analogy to the expression *paripūrṇa* one could say that it "fills" the lifetime with happy or unhappy events. • The works of Buddhaghosa (ca. 370-450 CE) are the earliest source for those two terms I could trace (see NYANATILOKA, *Buddhist Dictionary*, p. 390, HALBFASS, *Karma und Wiedergeburt*, p. 112f.), but even those works ascribed to a single author display a significant variance in their explanations. In the *Manorathapūraṇī*, vol. II (ed. WALLESER, p. 216, ad AN I, p. 135), *janakakamma* is actually responsible for one rebirth (*ekaṃ paṭisandhiṃ*), but not for any kind of continuation (*pavatta*). The continuation is achieved by *upatthambhakakamma*. In a simile, *janakakamma* is likened to the mother who gives birth once, while *upatthambhakakamma* is like the wet-nurse (*dhātī*) who fosters (*jaggati*) the child. In this explanation, *upatthambhakakamma* is

rather the force that continues something that has initially been brought about by *janakakamma*. It is *upatthambhakakamma* that makes one stay for hundreds of thousands of years in a fortunate realm (*anekāni vassasatasahassāni sugatibhavasmiṃ yeva vicarati*). Unfortunately, the *Manorathapūraṇī* does not make it clear whether death in rebirth during that period are brought about by *upatthambhakakamma*. Still, the explanation is clearly different from RAHULA's note on the AS. ▪ The *Manorathapūraṇī* then presents another opinion (*aparo nayo*), saying that *janakakamma* produces the material and immaterial *skandhas* (*rūpārūpavipākakkhandhe janeti*) both at rebirth but also during one's life (*paṭisandhiyam pi pavatte pi*). The role of the *upatthambakamma* is to support joy or suffering that arises (*uppajjanakasukhadukkhaṃ upatthambheti*) and to produce its continuity (*addhānaṃ pavatteti*). *Upatthambhakakamma* as such, it is said, does not have the power to produce "ripening" (*vipākaṃ janetuṃ na sakkoti*), and I assume *vipāka* is used here in a sense similar to our AS passage, i.e. rebirth in a certain *gati* (see SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 136). After another kind of karma (i.e. *janakakamma*) has given rebirth (*aññena kammena dinnāya paṭisandhiyā*), Buddhaghosa says, when "ripening" is born (*janite vipāke*), *upatthambhakakamma* "supports" joy and suffering (*uppajjanakasukhadukkhaṃ upatthambheti*, as above). I would not like to put too much emphasis on the literal meaning of *upatthambheti* here: It rather seems like a stylistic device of commentarial literature, explaining a certain verbal noun by using the respective finite verb in the commentarial sentence–which is to say: It is possible to interpret this opinion much in the sense of RAHULA's note. ▪ Not being an expert for Buddhaghosa, I was quite surprised to find the "other opinion" (*aparo nayo*) from the *Manorathapūraṇī* as the state-of-the-art explanation in the *Visuddhimagga*. Whatever may be the historical truth behind this, the appearance of that passage in the *Visuddhimagga* makes it possible to compare various translations. All three translations I looked at (Pe Maung-Tin, Nyanamoli, Nyanatiloka) understand *vipāka* as "result", or "Karmawirkung". In the interpretation of the phrase *aññena kammena dinnāya paṭisandhiyā janite vipāke...*, the three translations differ. NYANAMOLI (*The Path of Purification*, p. 698): "when result has already been produced in the provision of rebirth-linking by other kamma"; PE MAUNG-TIN (*The Path of Purity*, p. 725) "when rebirth has been granted, and a result yielded by another karma"; NYANATILOKA, (*Weg zur Reinheit*, p. 718): "sobald durch ein anderes Karma die Wiedergeburt erwirkt und eine Karmawirkung erzeugt ist". NYANAMOLI's rendering of *dinnāya paṭisandhiyā* and *janite vipāke* in the sense of an apposition is most convincing. The other two translators, in contrast, rather seem to advocate an understanding according to which *any* karmic result is initially brought about by *janakakamma* while its continuation (over more than the initial moment) is effected by *upatthambhakakamma*. That interpretation is based on, I think, a far too literal understanding of the verb *upatthambheti*. The same interpretation can be found in BHIKKHU BODHI, *Manual of Abhidhamma*, p. 201f.: "When an unwholesome kamma has exercised its productive function by causing a painful disease, other unwholesome kamma may support it by preventing medicines from working effectively, thereby prolonging the disease." It seems to me that the doctrine of *janakakamma* and *upatthambhakakamma,* when understood in the sense of RAHULA's note, answers a very simple and fundamental question, that is, does *karman* only affect the environmental and physiological conditions at one's birth, or does it also effect one's

fate in the course of one's life? When, on the other hand, the doctrine is understood in the sense of BHIKKHU BODHI and others, it becomes more of a scholastic refinement in which I neither see much applicability to existential human questions, nor a convincing consistency. (Note: See also the distinction between "conceivable" and "inconceivable" aspects of *karman* at AS 61,9-19. It is "conceivable" (*cintya*) that good *karman* leads to rebirth in higher realms, while bad *karman* leads to rebirth in lower realms, while it is inconceivable how *karman* designs the physical body, ripens at a certain time and location, etc. I infer that the principle "for this deed you will be reborn in heaven" (roughly equivalent to *janakakamma* or *vipākaphala*) is quite easy to grasp, while there are many points of controversy about how *karman* exactly influences our body or our environment (which implies the topics dealt with in the definition of *upatthambhakamma* as interpreted in the more practical way). As ASBh 73,8 says: Why the thorns (that hurt us) are sharp as a result of *karman* "is not included in the mind of [ordinary] people (*lokacintānantarbhava*)". On the other hand, I see nothing that would correlate to the Theravāda concept of *upatthambhakamma* as interpreted in the more scholastic way in the AS discussion about conceivable and inconceivable aspects of *karman*.) In the case of the animate body, which is the effect of *janakakamma*, the idea that *upatthambhakamma* would "keep it up" even seems contradictory with the above statement that the *rūpakkandha* (among others) is constantly produced by *janakakamma*, even as one's life proceeds (*pavatte pi*). Although that idea appears somewhat odd, it might well be based on the assumption that that one gets at birth a life-force, or life-span (*āyus*), which was considered similar to a physical faculty (see my notes on ASBh 65,9, *alpāyur*, and the discussion at *Kathāvatthu* VII.8 where the Theravādin argues that old age and death are not *kammavipāka*. See also the discussion of AKBh 73,26 (on the *jīvitenendriya*) in my notes ad ASBh 68,27-28. ▪ If in case one is reborn in a certain destiny for many lifetimes as the result of one major good or bad action, the repeated rebirth is clearly a result of *ākṣepaka* in the AS (see below, AS 54,14-15: *asty karmaikena karmaṇānekam ātmabhāvam* ***ākṣipati,*** and the commentary at ASBh 66,7-8). In the Theravāda model, in contrast, it seems to be *upatthambhakakamma* that assures one's remaining in a certain destiny for longer periods. See also the discussion in AKBh 258,10-259,3 (ad AK IV.95ab: *ekaṃ janmākṣipaty ekam anekaṃ paripūrakam*) and the notes in LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (*Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, pp. 198-200). ▪ Still, the problem remains that *janakakamma* is considered the cause for the material *skandha* (*rūpa...kkhandh[a]*). Strictly speaking, matter should not be the result of *karma* in Theravāda Abhidhamma, an issue which has been made clear in *Kathāvatthu* 349-355 and 380-394. Also in our AS section (AS 54,14-15), *karman* is the cause that "entails" (*ā-/kṣip*) *ātmabhāva*, a term which I translate as "existence", in the sense of "[one] existence [in a series of lifetimes]" (see LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Morale*, p. 5.), even though that hardly covers all of its connotations: On the one hand, the Tibetan (*lus*) and Chinese (身) equivalents for *ātmabhāva* simply mean "body" (see also SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 433, ns. 879, 889, who translates this term as "(basis of) personal existence), on the other, the controversial word *ātman* forms part of the compound. "Body" is certainly oversimplified, as, theoretically speaking, a life in the immaterial realm (*ārūpyadhātu*) is based on an *ātmabhāva* in one or the other way (See also P5567, fol. 53b3: *ātmabhāva* equated with

---

nāmarūpa, Tib. *lus ni ming dang gzugs so*). The Tibetan and Chinese translators probably thought of human existence, which naturally is often the main focus of scholastic arguments. Still, if "body" was meant, *kāya* would be more appropriate, denoting only the material aspect of human existence, as for example in ASBh 52,12f.: "the body only comes into being if endowed with consciousness and rots once [...] consciousness withdraws from it" (*kāyaḥ savijñānaka eva samudāgacchati, vijñānāpakrāntyā ca pūtībhavati*, see ROSPATT, *Momentariness*, p. 134, n. 293). ▪ In the compound *ātmabhāva*, the component *ātman* is interesting in so far as the initial disposition at birth plays a role in the argument of the Buddhist adherents to a "person" (Pāli *puggala*): To defend their position in debate see MCDERMOTT, "*Kathāvatthu* Kamma Debates", p. 425), they quote the Buddha (MN I, p. 482), saying that he sees beings (*satte*) as they are reborn (*upapajjamāne*) high or low (*hīne paṇīte*), with a good or bad complexion (*suvaṇṇe dubbaṇṇe*). I assume that it was not only the mention of "beings" which made the "personalists" quote this passage (in Sanskrit the component °*bhāva* and the term *sattva*–which I render as "being"–actually have two things in common with HEIDEGGER's term "Dasein": 1) they etymologically go back to verbs denoting existence in a more or less dynamic way, and 2) they are therefore too general to delineate the limits of their semantic range self-evidently.). On top of that, the initial disposition at birth was more fit to exemplify personal continuity than, for example, joy or suffering during one's lifetime. ▪ It seems that the Abhidharma scholars were to some extent struggling with the issues of a.) consciousness existing independently of matter, and b.) physical diversity among men. The latter phenomenon can nowadays be explained by the laws of genetic reproduction, just like its metaphor, the phenomenon of a plant growing from a seed. The Indian caste system, on the other hand, ascribed some mythical significance to the colour of the skin. Such ideas are reflected, e.g. in the term *dubbaṇṇa* in the *Cūḷakammavibhaṅgasutta* (MN, no. 135), and they might have influenced the Buddhist scholars trying to grasp and describe the relation between *karman* and the body. Still, the main thrust of Buddhism was certainly more egalitarian, as MALALASEKERA and JAYATILLEKE (*Buddhism and the Race Question*, pp. 5-8) , point out, referring to a *Suttanipāta* passage where the significance of physical diversity among human beings is negated. • On *ātmabhava*, see also CPD, s.v. *attabhāva*: 1) *attabhāva* can mean "existence of the soul," or 2) "existence as an individual proper nature". In most cases, nonetheless, it means "a living being, or its bodily form, person, personality" which the CPD interprets as "the various appearances of the *attā*," i.e. the way the self *appears* (and in this sense *attabhāva* is one of the words meaning "body"). This stands in contrast to the way it ultimately *is*, or, as the CPD puts it "the continual existence of the *attā*". • XUANZANG adds 異熟時 ("[at] the time of ripening"): "Wholesome or unwholesome *karman,* when producing its ripening [consisting in a new] birth in the good or bad destiny, has the function (業) of ...". • The syntax of the Tibetan sentence is ambiguous. Based on the Chinese, one is tempted to insert *tshe*: *dge ba dang mi dge ba'i las kyis ni bde 'gro dang ngan 'gror skye ba'i [tshe] 'phen pa dang / yongs su rdzogs par byed pa'i las su rig par bya'o //*. Unfortunately none of the Tibetan versions supports this.

[174] The double *tsheg* in $AS_{t,P}$ most probably indicates that an original *kyis* has been changed to *kyi* after completion of the printing blocks.

[175] This whole reconstruction is unsafe, and the Tibetan and Chinese versions differ.

[176] Cf. MSg I.24.

[177] "Ripening" here basically in sense of "the fruit of ripening", i.e. rebirth in a certain *gati*. Whether or not the birth in a specific family (see RAHULA's interpretation below) or the length of life (*'phen pa* in Tibetan) are determined through the function of entailing cannot be said with certainty here. • According to ERB (*Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti*, p. 174, n. 744), *ākṣipati* in the AKVy (synonymous to *gṛhṇāti* or *parigṛhṇāti* in the AK) means the actualisation of a karmic result. The karmic potential for the arising of a future dharma condenses to form that very result, it "grasps" (*gṛhṇāti*) the dharma it has long been directed to.

[178] This reconstruction is based on SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 433, n. 881f.

[179] Note that *upa-/pad* here seems to refer to "rebirth" in a broader sense, i.e. the process which begins at the moment of conception, and not to childbirth proper. For examples on the usage of *upa-/pad*, see BLEZER, *Kar gliṅ źi khro*, p. 17f.

[180] ASVy$_{t,D}$ (*skyes pa n+*) is illegible in the Tibetan Tripitaka edition, but it is clearly *skyes pa na* in the TBRC *par phud* edition.

[181] AS$_{t,D}$ renders *upapann[aḥ]* as *skyes pa na* which I follow (cf. AS$_{t,P}$: *skyes pa*; ASVy$_{t,P}$ *skyes pa ni*). AS$_c$ 生已 is ambiguous (cf. ASVy$_j$: 生れ已りて, "when they have taken birth") For the reconstruction, see SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 433, n. 881f.

[182] Cf. AKBh 258,10-13: *kim ekaṃ karma ekam eva janmākṣipati atha naikam api / tathā kim ekam api karmaikaṃ janmākṣipaty athānekam / eṣa hi siddhāntaḥ / ekam janmākṣipaty ekam* (AK IV.95a) *ekam eva janmākṣipaty ekam eva ca karma, nānekaṃ / janmeti nikāyasabhāgasyākhyā / tatra hi labdhe jāta ity ucyate /.* • This whole question whether one action (e.g. of killing) initiates exactly one future existence (i.e. its fruit of ripening) has been conceived as problematic also outside the Buddhist tradition. If, one could argue, every path of action would entail exactly one existence, the paths of actions committed in one lifetime would heap up the potential for hundreds of future lives, which would result in a rapidly increasing tailback. As far as I gather from HALBFASS (*Karma und Wiedergeburt*, p. 157) Vyāsa (5th century), in his *Yogabhāṣya* prefers the solution that many actions entail one existence (see ASBh 66,8-9). The solution proposed by the AS seems less concerned with scholarly consistency, and still allows moral instruction to the effect that "for exactly this deed, you will be reborn in hell", or "for exactly that deed, you will be reborn in hell so and so many times", without implying the unwanted tailback. The explanations of the ASBh, in turn, reflect a certain struggle for consistency, for in all cases the term "nourishing" (or, more literally "fattening") is used. This is, at least in the cases where only one action is the cause for future lives, another deviation from the original seed metaphor. One would basically expect that good or bad seeds are planted by actions. But the image the term "nourishing" in the ASBh invokes is that of adding manure (or water) to already existing seeds, without giving any clue as to where those seeds originally came from. It is not clear to me whether these explanations of the ASBh represent the highest stratum of an otherwise vague and unspecified imagination on the

part of the ASBh author, or whether they have been exposed in more detail elsewhere. The nourishing of the seeds is also mentioned in ASBh 31,15f. (see KRITZER, *Rebirth and Causation*, p. 28f.) and ASBh 32,16-17 (see KRITZER, op. cit., p. 34f.). See also my notes ad ASBh 64,22. ▪ Having mentioned the *Yogabhāṣya* and the agricultural seed metaphor, I want to add that Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*s (on which the *Yogabhāṣya* comments) also specify the "field" (or "soil", *kṣetra*) for the karmic seeds, which is ignorance (*avidyā*). It has been further stated that the *Yogasūtra*s and their commentaries have many points in common with the Sarvāstivāda and Sautrāntika traditions. See HALBFASS (*op.cit.*, pp. 154-158). As far as the "field" (*kṣetra*) is concerned, also AS 56,6-8 uses that term, but in the sense of the sufferer of action (see also ASBh 67,18). One could interpret that in turn as the object to work on in order to get good results, but I cannot provide any textual evidence to support this. ▪ The seed metaphor is used in still another sense in *Milindapañha* II, ch. 3 where it illustrates how time and origination in dependence can be without any beginning (the other example is the hen and the egg). See RHYS DAVIDS, *Questions of King Milinda: Part I*, p. 79f. At AN I, p. 203, *viññāna* is likened to the seed (*bīja*) that is moistened (*sineha*) by craving (*taṇhā*) in the field of *kamma*. See MATTHEWS, "Post-Classical", p. 139, n. 24, and WALDRON, *The Buddhist Unconscious*, pp. 26f. and 74f. Metaphors from plant life are also used in the *tathāgatagarbha* tradition, e.g. in the expression *padmagarbha*, again expressing notions of latency and gradual growth. See ZIMMERMANN, *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra*, pp. 39-46.

[183] Skt. *asti*, when standing in the beginning of a sentence and referring to a finite verb, means "it is indeed the case, that...." See SAKUMA, *Āśrayaparivṛtti*, vol. 2, p. 141, n. 776.

[184] Tib. *kyang* need not have a referent in Sanskrit. See, e.g., YBh 189,14-15: *asti karma kṛtam asty akṛtaṃ* ..., $\text{YBh}_{t,D}$ *dzi* 110a4-5: ... *yang yod do*.

[185] The prevailing concept here seems to be that of perpetuation. Many acts belonging to this category of *karman* assure the continuation of a chain of rebirths (*janmaparaṃparā*). Is it possibly *any* kind of *karman* with inflow (*sāsrava*) that is meant here? There is no mention of moral value in the ASBh, so it seems that even wholesome acts contribute to the entanglement in continuous rebirth.

[186] This section (AS 54,15-18) harmonizes to some extent contradictory models of karmic causality. See also AKBh 477,18ff., and *Xianyang shengjiao lun* 573c29-574a3. • The seed-fruit metaphor is only partially applicable when discussing the order of ripening: while many seeds can ripen on the same field, the number of karmic results an individual can experience simultaneously is limited. If the ripening of *karman* is thought of a pleasant or unpleasant feelings (i.e. a purely mental phenomenon), there can be only one at a time. • It should be noted that the concept of the five acts that entail immediate retribution (*pañcānantaryāṇi*, see below AS 58,18) still does not fit in smoothly with any of the models. In such a case, retribution of relatively grave (*gurutara*) actions comes into play, but only after the moment of death. Until then the accumulation and retribution of *karman* seem to proceed as usual. The explanation of YBh 185,20 differs: the five acts that entail immediate retribution are to be experienced in this lifetime.

[187] For a discussion of various kinds of accompaniment (*samanvāgama*), see AS 35,1-23.

[188] According to RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 85f., n. 3), there is a hierarchy among the following four principles, i.e. only if there is no grave action does the action of the moment of death produce its result. If there is "no particular" (?) action at the moment of death, then the action done most frequently will bear its fruit, or otherwise "an action accomplished in a past life".

[189] The importance of the last moment before death is stressed in a number of sources. According to the *Milindapañha*, the one who thinks of the Buddha in the last moment of his life will be reborn in heaven, even if he has sinned for a hundred years. In the final moment, one should direct one's thought to the Buddha. See SCHMITHAUSEN, "Critical Response", p. 206 and p. 222, ns. 12, 13, LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Morale*, p. 233. Note that the importance of the last *citta* before death (*maraṇacitta*) for one's future fate is stressed, to my knowledge, in all Abhidharma traditions. HALBFASS (*Karma und Wiedergeburt*, p. 58) points to the occurrence of that doctrine in the *Chāndogya-Upaniṣad* and the *Bhagavadgīta*, too. To me, it looks like a very practical exhortion to die with a peaceful mind or with a mind turned towards religion, and I assume this is originally unrelated to a scholastic proof of rebirth (with or without *ātman*), to a proof of the intermediate state (*antarābhava*), or to the correct interpretation of the *pratītyasamutpāda* formula. Once those issues are involved, the discourse gets really complicated (see, e.g., SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 58f., or TSONG KHA PA, *Stages of the Path*, vol. 1, pp. 316-322). ▪ On a more pragmatic level, believing that one can turn around one's fate through an *ars moriendi* may lead to moral irresponsibility, so it might be unwise for the Buddhist scholar to concede too much power to the final moment. NĀRADA (*Manual of Abhidharma*, p. 260f.) recounts the story of a habitual miscreant who nonetheless achieved a blissful rebirth through the force of a wholesome thought at the time of death, and the story of a righteous queen who still went to a bad destiny. NĀRADA's explanation that "these are only exceptional cases" is unsatisfying. BHIKKHU BODHI (*Manual of Abhidharma*, p. 204) has omitted both the examples and their explanation as "exceptional cases". But he left, although slightly rephrased, a reference to national custom, without commenting upon the value or history of that custom: "For this reason in Buddhist countries it is customary to remind a dying person of his good deeds or to urge him to arouse good thoughts during the last moment of his life." NĀRADA's original formulation was: "the custom [...] still prevails in Buddhist countries." NĀRADA and BHIKKHU BODHI abstain from an explicit approval or disapproval, but as for the AS, I preliminarily understand AS 42,14-19 to assert that the mental attitude at death is of utmost importance, and that even others can play a role in its quality (*svakuśalamūlabalādhānato [vā] paropasaṃhārato vā*).

[190] Those concepts of ripening in temporal order agree to agriculture in many respects: seeds (of the same plant) which are sown first will sprout and then bear fruit, or seeds of plants which have the nature of sprouting fast, or seeds which are nourished well.

[191] Or, for AS_t *thog mar* reconstruct *prathamam* or *pūrvam* (AS_c: 先)?

[192] According to RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 86, n. 1) the source for this sūtra reference is to be found in the explanation of the *pratītyasamutpāda* formula of the *Vibhaṅga*, p.

137,3-6: *tattha katamo kammabhavo / puññābhisaṅkhāro apuññābhisaṅkhāro āneñjābhisaṅkhāro*. Other parallels: YBh 192,4ff.; AKBh 227,11ff. • PRADHAN (*Abhidharmasamuccaya*, p. 17) has located a reference to the AS (probably this passage) in the *Abhisamayālaṃkārālokā* (ed. WOGIHARA) p. 218: *bahu puṇyam iti yadi nāmābhidharmasamuccaye nāmabhedaḥ kṛtaḥ kāmapratisaṃyuktaṃ kuśalaṃ puṇyaṃ / rūpārūpyapratisaṃyuktaṃ āniṃjyaṃ iti / tathāpy atra sāmānyena kuśalaṃ puṇyam / puṇyaṃ jñeyaṃ rūpadhātāv apy arthasya samanvāgatvāt /*.

[193] The category of "immovable" *karman* (or, more precisely, "*karman* [leading to a state of] immovability") is explained only briefly in the ASBh. For an overview, see, e.g., GUENTHER, *Jewel Ornament*, p. 80f, for more details, MUROJI, "Āniñjya-karma", and DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 476, n. 28.

[194] According to RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 85, n. 3), *paripūraka-karma* [sic] corresponds to *upatthambhakakamma* in the Pāli Abhidhamma. For an explanation, see above (AS 54,12, *ākṣepakaṃ*).

[195] ASVy$_c$ 728c4: it brings about the ripening elsewhere "when the [respective] conditions meet" (遇緣). That probably made a rendering of *api* unnecessary.

[196] This statement seems to be based on the doctrine that immovable *karman* accumulated by practicing absorption on the first *dhyāna* level will bring about rebirth in the first *dhyāna* heaven, and so on.

[197] To the same effect, AK IV.46cd.

[198] This phrase belongs to the context of the twelve-limbed origination in dependence. See TRIPĀṬĪS, *Nidānasaṃyukta*, nos. 10.11b and 10.12, KRITZER, *Rebirth and Causation*, pp. 32-34, and SCHMITHAUSEN, "Zur zwölfgliedrigen Formel", p. 43, n. 7 and pp. 64-66. • The necessity to explain the phrasing of the "origination-in-dependence" formula has enriched this section with a soteriological aspect, revealing fundamental ignorance (*avidyā*) as the cause for (almost?) all activity of living beings. Cf. also RAHULA, *Compendium*, p. 38. • The category of "undefined" (*avyākṛta*) *karman* is not mentioned here, even though the passage deals with the perpetuation of existence. See my notes ad AS 53,7-8. • Although the AS here quotes a phrase from the formula of Origination in Dependence (*pratītyasamutpāda*), there is no attempt to explain it in terms of the *trisvabhāva* theory, not even in the ASBh explanations. Robert KRITZER (*Rebirth and Causation*, p. 277) has already observed the absence of the *trisvabhāva* theory in the AS in another context (where it appears in the MSg). Also the *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra* proclaims Origination in Dependence to be the content of the dependent nature (*paratantrasvabhāva*). See FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, pp. 281, 284. Explanations of the dependent nature are especially complex in the MSg. See FRAUWALLNER, *op.cit.*, pp. 300, 305, 329f, 335f., and CONZE, *Buddhist Thought in India*, p. 292, n. III 3,3, 21. On the Four Noble Truths explained in terms of the *trisvabhāva* theory, see KRITZER, *Rebirth and Causation*, p. 171.

[199] This distinction between two kinds of bewilderment (*saṃmoha*) seems to reflect the distinction between mundane right view and supramundane right view–as the Pāli

tradition has preserved it in MN III, p. 72. Mundane right view consists in belief in rebirth and the karma doctrine, respect for one's parents and for religious authorities. It is connected with outflow (Pāli *āsava*), but meritorious (Pāli *puññabhagīya*). Supramundane right view is described as the analysis of the factors which is a component of awakening (*dhammavicayasambojjhaṅga*), the power of insight (*paññābala*), free from outflow (*āsava*). See NYANAMOLI, *Discourse on Right View* (unpaginated). • These explanations *avidyā* match those of AS 45,16-18 (*avidyāsaṃyojana*) in so far as they designate delusion about *karman* and the Four Noble Truths as the ideological contents of *avidyā*, and they resemble those on wrong view in the *Savitarkādibhūmi* (YBh 178,13-180,4, see AYMORÉ, *Karma*, pp. 64, 107) and at AS 7,17-8,3 (ASBh 6,6-18). In contrast, a definition of *avidyā* in the *Savitarkādibhūmi* (YBh 163,19f., see AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 178f.) focuses on the psychological aspects (e.g. *smṛtisaṃpramoṣa*, etc.) with no mention of the contents whatsoever, while the definition of *mithyādṛṣṭi* at ASBh 64,8-10 is limited to epistemological aspects (i.e. regarding something existing as not existing, etc.) exclusively.

200 I reconstruct *saṃmoha* in accordance with ASBh 66,19 (*de la rmongs [na]*, corresponding to *tatra saṃmohaḥ*) and against ASBh 66,16, 19 (*saṃmūḍha*). Skt. *saṃmoha* is also the equivalent for *rmongs pa* at MaVyu 7538, 7539. It is nonetheless possible that the AS reads *saṃmūḍha* for *rmongs pa* in all five occurrences at AS 55,1-3, or *saṃmoha*, in which case *saṃmūḍha* in the ASBh would be a rather liberal, or explicatory, rendering.

201 For *apuṇya*, $ASBh_t$ uses the rendering *mi dge ba* although in should be *bsod nams ma yin pa* (in analogy to MaVyu, no. 6386). Systematically, *apuṇya* and *akuśala* are identical (see definition of *apuṇya* above).

202 In this context, *tattvārtha* is explained in terms of the Four Noble Truths and, more concretely, as suffering (i.e. the First Noble Truth) being the nature of the world. Here *tattvārtha* has the connotation of a less obvious meaning, veiled by a more superficial one: It is not enough to understand that the world is the world, but that it is suffering, even when it appears to be pleasant. Cf. BÖHTLINGK and ROTH, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung*, s.v. *tattvārtha*: "1.) die Wahrheit; 2.) am Ende eines Comp. der wahre Sinn-, die wahre Bedeutung von". • Note that even the ASBh does not mention Mahāyānistic interpretations of the true nature of *saṃsāra* as emptiness, suchness, *dharmatā*, or the like, here. The explanation presented here is completely acceptable to the non-Mahāyāna schools. Cf. HEUPERS ("Foundation of Buddhist Ethics", p. x) who wrongly considers this mention of *tattvārtha* to be one of the "references to Mahāyāna doctrines" in this section. On *tattvārthasaṃmoha*, see also SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 537, n. 1438, on *tathatā* in the non-Mahāyānistic sense, id., *Nirvāṇa-Abschnitt*, p. 105 and KRAMER, *Fünf*-vastu-*Abschnitt*, p. 63. • Chapter 1.4. (*Tattvārtha-paṭala*) of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* presents various explanations about true reality (p. 25f.). The third of those explanations teaches true reality as the Four Noble Truths, but that is surpassed by a fourth level of understanding: insight into *dharmanairātmya* and the *tathatā*, which removes the "veils of what is to be known" (*jñeyāvaraṇa*) and is only realized by the Bodhisattvas and the Buddhas. FRAUWALLNER (*Philosophie des Buddhismus*, pp. 266

and 272f.) contrasts this theory with the traditional Hīnayāna view that liberation comes about through realizing the Four Noble Truths (i.e. the third level). ▪ Also Harivarman, in his **Tattvasiddhi*, states explicitly that insight into the Four Noble Truths is not enough for full liberation: the adept also has to see that there is no self in neither living beings nor their *skandha*s (I rely on SCHMITHAUSEN, "Liberating Insight", p. 245, referring to **Tattvasiddhi* 362b2 here). Now, the fact that the AS in contrast does not distinctively mention *śūnyatā* or the like in the context of *tattva* here makes the passage acceptable to all Buddhists, but it does not rule out the possibility that the Four Noble Truths were explained in Mahāyānist terms when the AS was taught to a Mahāyānist audience, or that its final redactor had that doctrine in mind. On *nirodhasatya* in Mahāyāna, see SCHMITHAUSEN, *art.cit.*, p. 246f.

[203] This explanation of the ASBh implies that what is objectively suffering (*duḥkha*) might be subjectively experienced as joy (*sukha*). That doctrine may appear paradox at first sight, but it is common in Buddhist Abhidharma. See SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 534f., n. 1428 and id. ("Leidhaftigkeit"). • The question of what was the ultimate *sukha* was, by the way, never decisively settled in Buddhism. At first, the aim of the non-Buddhist Yogin was declared *duḥkha* (in so far as it was *mundane*). But Mahāyāna Buddhists soon claimed that the state of the Arhat, the *terminus ad quem* of the so-called Hīnayāna, was useless for others (and thus of inferior *value*). The tantrists then strove for the "great joy" (*mahāsukha*), which was to be achieved in one lifetime. Although in essence not different from the goal of the non-tantric Mahāyānists, it was less *burdensome* and more real. In Tibetan Buddhism, opinions vary as to whether *rdzogs chen* is superior to *mahāmudrā*, and so on. ▪ Nonetheless, the doctrine that real *sukha* cannot be achieved through non-Buddhist paths mostly remained intact in all Buddhist schools, while the state of the Arhat, limited as it may be, was to my knowledge never considered *duḥkha*. Therefore, although the ASBh author was quite settled in Mahāyāna thought, the current explanations on *duḥkhata*s conform to Abhidharma in its "āgamic", i.e. pre-Mahāyāna state. • With the concept of a "worldly path" (*laukikamārga*) non-Buddhist goal of liberation and joy in the *brahmaloka* (on which see HALBFASS, *Karma und Wiedergeburt*, p. 63) was put in the same category as the practice of deep absorption (*dhyāna*) and both degraded in their soteriological value, but never completely abandoned. See also DELHEY, *Samāhitā Bhūmiḥ*, p. 42, n. 114.

[204] That the wholesome and immovable kinds of *karman* are a cause for rebirth in the three realms is taught at AS 54,19-21.

[205] The matter of defilements that cause unvirtuous deeds is discussed at AKBh 240,15-242,16. The section starts with a sūtra quotation (*sūtra uktaṃ prāṇātipāto bhikṣavas trividho lobhajo dveṣajo mohajo yāvan mithyādṛṣṭir iti* /, AKBh 240,15f.). According to SCHMITHAUSEN ("Ethics of Nature", p. 41, n. 76), this corresponds to SĀ 274b24-26. Related passages are AN I, p. 201f., 134f., AN III, p. 338f. See also PĀSĀDIKA, *Kanonische Zitate*, p. 85. • I see no reason why these two steps, preparation and completion, should not be another way of describing the two kinds of motivation (*samutthāna*) explained in AKBh 203,12-15. The causal motivation (*hetusamutthāna*) is described as initially projecting (i.e. motivating) an action (*hetusamutthānaṃ*

pravartakam ākṣepakatvāt, AKBh 203,15). The motivation of that moment (*tatkṣaṇasamutthāna*) is "following at the time of the act" (*tatkṣaṇasamutthānam anuvartakaṃ kriyākālanuvartanāt*, AKBh 203,15), in the sense that after the first moment (*kṣaṇa*) of action, the motivation of that moment is still there in every moment one does the action. See also my notes on AS 54,11-12. Note that we have a twofold scheme here which is quite different from the fivefold scheme at AS 53,13-14, and that the term *prayoga* means something different in these two passages.

206 The compound *lobhadveṣamoha* is not contained as such in the following ASBh passage, but attested in YBh-Index-CST (s.v. 貪瞋癡纏). Cf. *rāgadveṣamoha* in YBh 168,15, YBh 169,2,13,17, and AKBh 358,2, 370,17.

207 $ASBh_t$: "those who wish the meat and so on" (*sha la sogs pa 'dod pa rnams ni*); $ASVy_c$ 728c21: "one does it for the sake of the skin, meat, and so on" (爲皮肉等故).

208 AKBh 241,1: "[Stealing] out of hatred, [is that which is done] in order to suppress an enemy." (read: *dveṣajaṃ yad vairaniryātanārtham*, = AKBh and *Abhidharmadīpa* 154). • Note that the issue of damaging another's property is not addressed here, though considered unwholesome for monastics in the Vinaya. See SCHMITHAUSEN, *Sentience of Plants*, p. 34.

209 The element indicated by °*ādi* is harmful intent (*vyāpāda*).

210 The misreading *dveṣeṇaiva* of $ASBh_T$ may have been caused by a confusion with the next phrase.

211 YBh 182,9-10 (ed. AYMORÉ): *parasvasīkaraṇābhiprāyaniścayaprayoge tanniṣṭhāyāṃ ca*. AYMORÉ, *Karma*, p. 117: "sofern der ‹diesem› Trachten nach dem Sichaneignen des Eigentums anderer ‹entsprechende› feste Entschluß vorbereitet und vollzogen wird."

212 Addition in the ASVy: "Lying [means that] one behaves [driven] by greed, hatred, or delusion with regard to what one has seen" (*brdzun ni mthong ba la chags pa dang / zhes sdang dang / gti mug gis spyod par 'gyur ro*, $ASVy_{t,P}$ 243b8-244a1). That phrase is absent in the $ASVy_c$ (cf. $ASVy_c$ 729a4)!

213 According to ŚĀKYA MCHOG LDAN, this fourfold list explains aspects of force (or power) of *karman* (*las kyi nus pa'i rnam grangs kyi bshad pa*, AS-Śāk, p. 212,6).

214 In analogy to *sādhāraṇaṃ karma*, *balavat* and *karma* should not be treated as a compound (against RAHULA, *Compendium*, p. 87). Also PRADHAN has rendered *balavat karma* uncompounded (AS 56,5).

215 This reconstruction slightly differs from that presented in SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 491, n. 1302.

216 Strictly speaking, the question about the beginning of *saṃsāra* remains unanswered in this passage, and what is described is rather its perpetuation. Neither *karman* nor defilements chronologically predate beings and the universe as a whole in Buddhist thought. • On *sādhāraṇakarman*, see also ASBh 35,5f.: *sarvasattvasādhāraṇakarmādhipatyaṃ pratītya mahāpṛthivyadhinām utpādāt*, YBh 30,21-22, AKBh 179,2-3 (ad AK

III.90ab) and 11f., 192,3-5. LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Morale*, p. pp. 168-173 (cosmogony), SCHMITHAUSEN, "Ethics of Nature", p. 65, n. 189 and id., *External World*, p. 51, n. 64. ▪ Common *karman* was seen by XUANZANG (*Cheng weishi lun* 10c12-15) as an explanation why this manifold external world, "*rūpa*, and so on, that is, the [four] great elements and the matter that derives from them (色等器世間。即外大種及所造色)" appears similarly (無異) to various beings even though consciousness is transformed (變) into the imagination (相) of external objects for each being individually (各別). See SCHMITHAUSEN, "Spiritual Practice and Philosophical Theory", p. 237, and LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, p. 135. On "imagination (相)", see SCHMITHAUSEN, *External World*, p. 13, n. 12. ▪ The sentence quoted above (ASBh 35,5-6) appears in the context of cosmogony as one of the aspects of origination in dependence (*pratītyasamutpāda*). On this issue, see also SCHMITHAUSEN, *art.cit.*, p. 65, n. 188, and KRITZER, *Rebirth and Causation*, p. 64f. ▪ An exception to the rule that the external world is created from common *karman* seem to be the individual hells (*pratyeka-narakāḥ*) as taught at AKBh 165,4. Any of those hells is created by the *karman* of each individual being who is born within it, while the other sixteen hells come about under the influence (*ādhipateya*) of the *karman* all beings. ● MKHAN PO GZHAN DGA': "What is common [*karman*]? It is the cause for the differentiating of the receptacle world that appears commonly [to all beings]" (*thun mong ba gang zhe na / gang thun mong du sna[ng] ba'i snod kyi 'jig rten rnam par 'byed pa'i rgyu'o*, AS-gZhan-dga', fol. 112a5f.). ● The VinSg states that it is the *ālayavijñāna* which brings forth both, living beings and the external world: *'di ltar de ni sems can gyi 'jig rten 'grub pa'i rtsa ba yin te / dbang po rten dang bcas pa rnams dang / 'jug pa'i rnam par* (*zi* 8a6) *shes pa rnams skyed par byed pa yin pa'i phyir ro // snod kyi 'jig rten 'grub pa'i rtsa ba yang yin te / snod kyi 'jig rten [b]skyed par byed pa yin pa'i phyir ro* / $\text{VinSg}_{t,P}$ *zi* 8a5-6 /. YBh_c 581a26-29: 由此識是有情世間生起根本。能生諸根根所依處及轉識等故。亦是器世間生起根本。由能生起器世間故. This passage is not without pathos and it should not be misunderstood to the effect that there is only one *ālayavijñāna*, a transpersonal one. On $\text{VinSg}_{t,P}$ *zi* 8a7-8, see below. ● MSg I.60, explaining the *ālayavijñāna*, describes its common and individual characteristics (*mtshan nyid*, see the *bhāṣya* on the MSg, P 5551, *li* 169b2). The *ālyavijñāna* is "common" in so far as it is (figuratively speaking) the seed for the receptacle world, :"special" in so far as is the seed for the world of beings (*thun mong ni snod kyi 'jig rten gyi sa bon gang yin pa'o / thun mong ma yin pa ni so so rang gi skye mched kyi sa bon gang yin pa'o //*). See also ARAMAKI, *Paratantrasvabhāva (I)*, p. 48, ltrp., and KRAMER, *Fünf*-vastu-*Abschnitt*, p. 159, n. 294. The MSg goes on to say that "common" is what is the seed from which (seemingly external) objects arise that have no feeling (*thun mong gang yin pa de ni tshor ba med pa 'byung ba'i sa bon no*). The *upanibandhana* commentary on the MSg further specifies that this "common" characteristic brings forth a special kind of consciousness (*rnam par rig pa*, **vijñapti*). And that consciousness consists in an appearance (of a seemingly external object), in the form (or, in the place?, *der*) it appears, to all who happen to perceive it (lit. "enjoy it, partake of it, make use of it", *spyod pa*, due to their sharing same common aspect). That form of consciousness appears "under the power" of a result (lit. "ripening", *rnam par smin pa*), which in turn comes forth according to one's own *karman* (*thung mong ba ni*

rang gi las dang mthun pa'i rnam par smin pa'i dbang gis de la spyod pa po thams cad la der snang ba'i rnam par rig pa skye ba'i phyir ro //, P 5552, *li* 267a8-b1). ▪ This passage does not make it explicit what is meant by "under the power of (*dbang gis*, **ādhipateya*) the result", which is a rather loose description of the causal relationship between the ripening of *karman* on the one hand, and the appearance of (seemingly) external objects on the other. It is surely an allusion to the *adhipatiphala*, but in this passage it is left to the reader to figure out what exactly the ripening of one's *karman* has to do with external appearances. ▪ It is also not made clear whether "consciousness" (*rnam par rig pa*, which is better translated as "perception" in other contexts) here refers to one of the five internal kinds of sense perception, or to one of the five kinds of (seemingly) external sense objects that are ultimately nothing but consciousness (see MSg II.5). Judging from the doctrinal context, however, quite surely the latter is meant, for an internal sense perception is always accompanied by a feeling (*vedanā*). ● In so far as they both bring forth a result that is more than individual feeling (*vedanā*), common *karman* and the *adhipatiphala* are similar. That issue is addressed at AKBh 95,17: *adhipatiphalaṃ kasmāt pratisaṃvedayate / sādhāraṇakarmasaṃbhūtatvāt /*. LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (*Morale*, p. 168f.) ascribes the role of the cosmogonic force to the *adhipatiphala*, stating that it is the *adhipatiphala* that creates the universe, or the "collective force" of the being's actions. For the time being, I assume that the term *adhipatiphala*, is normally used for environmental circumstances, while the term *sādhāraṇakarman* is used with more abstract cosmological or ontological connotations. Even though the two terms may be interchangeable in many contexts, I know of no passage that explicitly teaches cosmogony as such to be an *adhipatiphala*. For example AKBh 165,4 (ad AK III.59cd) contains the phrase *sarv[a]sattvakarmādhipatyanirvṛttāḥ* (conjecture against *sarve sattvakarma°* in accordance with Tib. *sems can thams cad kyi las*), but as far as I see, that means "under the influence of the *karman* of all beings [...]." ● Also AS 37,8f. (on the Truth of Suffering) teaches that the external world is produced by *karman*. The sentence reads "Whatever is the world of beings and whatever is the receptacle world, generated by *karman* and defilements, and dominated by (in the sense of "brought about by the power of") *karman* and defilements, all that is suffering" (*sems can gyi 'jig rten gang yin pa dang / snod kyi 'jig rten gang yin pa las dang nyon mongs pas bskyed pa / las dang nyon mongs pa'i dbang gis byung ba 'di mtha' dag ni sdug bsngal gyi bden pa'o //* $AS_{t,P}$ 87b7f., cf. ASBh 49,6: *yaś ca sattvaloko yaś ca bhājanalokaḥ karmakleśajanitaḥ karmakleśādhipateya ity ābhyām tayoḥ sattvabhājanalokayor duḥkhatvakāraṇaṃ jñāpayati.* There are no comments whatsoever in the ASBh on the generation of pure worlds. The AS sentence is almost fully quoted in the ASBh, and I suspect some of those sentences to have been added quite late in or after the composition process of the AS–see my notes on HAKAMAYA, "Dharmaviniścaya Chapter", ad AS 85,8-10, in the introduction). In a footnote, RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 61, n. 2) explains that *janita* refers to beings, while *ādhipateya* refers to the external world. That matches the Tibetan and Chinese translations of the AKVy, where those two mentioned factors (*karmakleśajanita* and *karmakleśādhipateya*) are related to *sattvaloka* and *bhājanaloka* "in that order" ($ASVy_t$ *go rims ltar*, $ASVy_c$ 次第). To the same effect, **Mahāvibhāṣā* 508a19f. teaches that all beings are born from their own *karman* and defilements (自業煩惱而生) while

inanimate things (非情數) are commonly brought about (共所引起) under the influence of the dominant force (增上力) of the *karman* of all sentient beings (see COX, *Disputed Dharmas*, p. 236, n. 14, s.a. AKBh 165,4). Already RIG PA'I RAL GRI interprets the above AS passage in that sense, saying that *janita* refers to the *sattvaloka* and *ādhipateya* to the *bhājanaloka* (... *snod ni de gnyis kyi dbang gis byung ba zhes sbyar ro*, AS-Rig-ral, p. 381,5). On that differentiation, RGYAL TSHAB RJE elaborates: "It is called 'generated' and 'arisen under the influence', so that one may understand that the [fruit of] ripening and the sovereign fruit of essence and the receptacle [respectively] are different (*bcud dang snod las nyon gyi rnam smin dang bdag 'bras mi 'dra bar shes pa'i ched du bskyed pa dang / dbang gis byung ba zhes bya'o /*, AS-rGyal-tshab, p.796,2-3). And CHOS 'BYOR DPAL BZANG (15th. c.) comments upon the same AS passage, saying: "The impure sentient beings are born from individual *karman* and defilements; The receptacles arise under the influence of common *karman* and defilements (*ma dag pa'i sems can rnams ni mthun mongs* [sic] *ma yin pa'i las dang nyon mongs pas skyed / snod rnams ni mthun mongs* [sic] *pa'i las nyon gyi dbang gis byung ba*, ACIP-S0999, fol. 180b). ▪ That interpretation seems accurate, even though /*jan* is used for the *bhājanaloka* for example at AKBh 192,3 and 6 (ad AK IV.I), VinSg$_{t,P}$ *zi* 8a5-6 (quoted above), and especially at AS 37,9f., where is said that the pure realms (AS$_t$ *yongs su dag pa'i 'jig rten gyi khams*, AS$_c$ 清淨世界 = **pariśuddhā lokadhātavaḥ*) are neither generated by *karman* and defilements nor arisen under the influence of *karman* and defilements. The *dBu ma la 'jug pa'i 'grel bshad* (fol. 26b1-3) contains a rephrasing of that passage, saying that those two designations apply to the world of beings and the receptacle world belonging to the pure realms (*'jig rten gyi khams yongs su dag pa'i sems can gyi 'jig rten dang / snod kyi 'jig rten*) respectively, and JĀYANANDA goes on to say that they (the receptacle *and* the beings?) rather spring forth from inconceivable wishes (*'on kyang bsam gyis mi khyab pa'i smon lam las nges par 'byung ba*, corresponding to AS 37,10=AS$_{t,P}$ 88a1), an argument which seems more poetical that technical: Actually, the celestial Bodhisattvas, in so far as they are *sattvas*, do not *originally* spring forth from their *praṇidhāna*, it is just that they do not pass into *nirvāṇa* due to their *praṇidhāna*. It even might even be a play of words with **naiṣkramya* (Tib. *nges par 'byung ba*) which means "stepping out, coming forth" as well as the determination to get out of *saṃsāra*, the attitude underlying one's *praṇidhāna*. In the above examples /*jan* and **naiṣkramya* are used in a partly figurative sense. Still, as for the interpretation of AS 37,8f., I know of no text where *ādhipateya* would be explicitly applied to the *sattvaloka*. ▪ Nonetheless, the above considerations do not answer the question for the *semantical* difference between *janita* and *ādhipateya*. If individual *karman* is the cause for living beings while common *karman* is the cause for the external world, what is, then, the difference between those processes of origination? For the time being, I cannot answer that question but I can only present some assumptions on the basis of rather commonsensical deductions:

a.) The idea that meritorious behaviour influences crops, livestock, wealth and so on may be older than the idea of the whole world being generated by *karman*: The fields of a disciplined farmer will normally look better than the fields of a drunkard, and the promise of the Buddhist monks was, as far as I see, that the fields of a Buddhist lay follower will yield better results if he abstains from unwholesome deeds such as wrong views. In the

same way, the state of a king following the ten wholesome paths of action will flourish. I think it possible, but by no means established, that in that context the term *adhipatiphala* was introduced, whence the terms *adhipatya* and *ādhipateya* were derived once the Buddhist scholars turned to the issue of cosmogony. The teachings on the *adhipatiphala* were surely popular with laypeople, i.e. a group outside the monastic scholarly circles, and in the same way I assume the impulse to address cosmogony came from outside those circles, while the Buddha himself had allegedly refused to discuss it.

b.) Even though a huge strand Buddhist scholasticism turned against views of an *ātman* or a *pudgala*, there was most probably still an unreflected differentiation between the birth of a living being and the construction of an unanimated universe. Man comes into being with all senses complete, while external things are simply there, or their process of composition can be more clearly observed at all stages.

At birth, the elements have come together almost invisibly and miraculously around individual's *cittasaṃtāna*, leaving him no chance to influence or control the process. On the other hand, taking a monsoon rain as an example, man can observe how first heavy winds blow, how clouds then come together, water falls on the earth where, once the earth has dried, plants grow and animals graze. That is, I assume, the real-life experience the Buddhist myth of cosmogony is linked to. Man is mostly an outside observer to such a monsoon rain, but he can try to influence it through ritual performances, wholesome behaviour or, through building shelter and cultivating his fields in accordance with the wordly sciences, especially in accordance with the annual circles described by astrology (planting before it rains, harvesting before the sun burns, being prepared for autumn warfare..., all, I think, reflected in Buddhist apocalyptic mythology).

Such are the existential concerns of laypeople the Buddhist scholars responded to. In this context, again, the **body** is a kind of borderline case between the individual and the external world. It seems to me, that Abhidharma authors often found it unnecessary to present a clear classification of this animated matter, the appropriated *rūpaskandha*. Trying to take the stance of a layperson not educated in Abhidharma, it would only come naturally that the body belongs to the *sattvaloka* rather than the *bhājanaloka* (to the same effect, $\text{VinSg}_{\text{t,P}}$ *zi* 8a5-6, quoted above). That becomes particularly clear when one compares the explanations of the concordant fruit with those of the sovereign fruit (*adhipatiphala*): As a concordant fruit, one is often ill, while as a sovereign fruit, the "external objects" (i.e. food in this case) will be of bitter taste, and so on. The sovereign fruit thus clearly does not affect the body *directly*, while the concordant fruit does (see the "additional leaf", ASBh 65,8-20). • In non-Buddhist tantrism, the creationist concepts of "common creation" (*sādhāraṇasṛṣti*) and "individual creation" (*asādhāraṇasṛṣti*) match those of "common *karman*" and "individual *karman*" encountered in the Abhidharma. See BRUNNER, et al., *Tāntrikābhidhānakośa*, s.v. *asādhāraṇasṛṣṭi*. (I speak of "non-Buddhist tantrism", in order to avoid the term "Hindu tantric literature" which BRUNNER et al. use. This is not to say that a distinction between Buddhist and non-Buddhist tantrism is always feasible or useful.)

[217] I chose to translate *sādhāraṇa* as "common" in accordance with its Tibetan equivalent *thun mong ba*. Unfortunately the opposite English term "uncommon" has connotations

such as "outstanding" which are not necessarily implied in Skt. *asādhāraṇa*, which I therefore translate as "individual", a term which has two major disadvantages: 1) While "not common" is clearly a negative expression, the negation in its original etymology does not stand out as clearly to the English reader since an adjective "*dividual" is not in use. Additionally, "individual" is a rather desired attribute in contemporary culture, especially when it is contrasted to "common" (unsophisticated, vulgar, plebeian, etc., which then appears similar to Skt. *kṣudra*). 2) "Individual" literally expresses non-divisibility or non-dividedness, while in Abhidharma it is an important point that the owner of *asādhāraṇa-karma is* divisible into five groups (*skandhāḥ*) or other *dharmas*. • The exact etymology of *sādhāraṇa* is not clear. According to WACKERNAGEL (*Altindische Grammatik*, vol. II,2, p. 196) the term is already attested in the *Ṛgveda* with the meaning "common", and, as far as I understand WACKERNAGEL, could either derive from "*sa-dharmaṇ*" ("having the same *dharma*, having a common *dharma*") by way of a double *vṛddhi*, as he suggest on p. 125, or *sādhāraṇa* could derive from (other?) cognates of the root *√dhṛ*, hold (p. 196). The latter interpretation is more obvious since the word "*ādhāraṇa*" is attested by BÖHTLINGK and ROTH (*Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, s.v.), meaning "carrying, holding", related to *ādhāra* (s.v.), meaning "support", "container", "dam", and so on, *sādhāraṇa* appears to me as *ādharāṇa* with the prefix *sa*, which would suggest "common" in the sense of "commonly holding," or "commonly containing," of which I am by no means sure. The original etymology of *sādhāraṇa* did probably not play a role in its usage in Buddhist systematics: it is not reflected in its Tibetan and Chinese equivalents.

[218] I take "differentiate" (*rnam par 'byed pa*, *vibhajati*) here to mean that *karman* brings about the sentient beings and external phenomena in their variety, in analogy to AKBh 192,5: "The variety of the world (or/and beings, *loka*) is born from *karman*" (*karmajaṃ lokavaicitryam*, the latter term interpreted by HALBFASS, *Karma und Wiedergeburt*, p. 98, as "qualitative Mannigfaltigkeit"). XUANZANG translates "the distinction into various species/kinds" (種種差別, AS_c 679b25-26). The AS phrasing is similar to the *Cūḷakammavibhaṅgasutta* (MN, no. 135), "Action is what differentiates beings" (*kammaṃ satte vibhajati*), but the *Cūḷakammavibhaṅgasutta* passage (explained below, AS 60,23-61,7) clearly says nothing more than that *karman* is the cause for diversity *among* living beings. • RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 87) mistranslates "changes" (for PRADHAN's *nānāvidhaṃ vikalpaṃ karoti*?) and understands changes in nature (seasons and so on) only, nature being the agent of this kind of action ("l'action de la nature"). • Cf. AS 27,21: *saṃskārāḥ kiṃkarmakā / gatiṣu ca sattvān vibhajanti* ...(*'du byed ci'i las can yin na / 'gro ba rnams su sems can da rnam par 'byed pa dang /*, $AS_{t,P}$ 77a). KRITZER, *Rebirth and Causation*, p. 34: "What is the function of the Karmic Forces? They distinguish beings according to the destinies (*gatiṣu*), and ... ". ASBh 32,14-15: *saṃskārā gatiṣu sattvān vibhajanti karmavaśena sattvānāṃ gatyantaragamanavaicitryāt* .... KRITZER, *Rebirth and Causation*, p. 34: "The Karmic Forces distinguish beings according to the destinies because, due to karma, there is a diversity of different destinies to which beings go." My translation of the last compound (*gatyantaragamanavaicitryāt*) is: "because there are various [ways of] going into another destiny". That translation is, however, not helpful to establish the meaning of Tib. *rnam par 'byed pa* (**vibhājaka*) as

"differentiating" in the sense of "unfolding" (i.e. cosmogony), which I assume for the current passage. • Interestingly, the explanations of *Daśabhūmikasūtra* 99.2-3 on the limb "impulses" (parallel to AS 27,21, see, KRITZER, *Rebirth and Causation*, p. 35) make no mention of either "destination" or "receptacle world", but only of the "generation of future results" (*anāgatavipākanirvṛtta*). The *Daśabhūmikasūtra* therefore reflects a more individual and less cosmological perspective.

[219] For this reconstruction, cf. SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 491, n. 1302: "... *bhājanalokavibhajakam* (?)". As I was informed by Professor SCHMITHAUSEN, the reconstruction of *rnam par 'byed pa* as a finite verb is preferable, in analogy to passages such as AS 90,2-3: *yo ... apuprāpnoti* ($AS_{t,P}$ 128b7-8: *gang ... thob pa'o*), or AS 70,1-2: *yena ... prajāhati* ($AS_{t,P}$ 113b1-2: *gang gis ... spong ba'o*). See also AS 27,21.

[220] It appears that the AS is presenting two explanations of common vs. individual *karman*. According to the first (AS 55,11-13), individual *karman* concerns the world of living beings, while common *karman* concerns the external world. According to the second explanation, individual *karman* refers only to living beings as far as their actions and their experiences do not influence other living beings, while common *karman* refers to the external world as well as to actions that influence other sentient beings in one or the other way. The same two explanations are found in the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāgavṛtti*, sections 2.4. and 2.5. (see MATHES, *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, pp. 75f. and 124-127). • Note that the AS does not mark these sentences on the mutual influence as an explanation on common *karman*, containing not more than the word *ādhipateya* as a possible hint. Only the following ASBh explanations supply the word *sādhāraṇa*. MKHAN PO GZHAN DGA' did not include the equivalent to *sādhāraṇa* in his rephrasing of the ASBh sentence (see AS-gZhan-dga', fol. 112a6-b2). • XUANZANG marks the sentence "A being who would not [...] is not easy to find" as a *sūtra* quotation (是故經言, AS_c 679b28). I could not locate a *sūtra* source for it. • As far as I understand RGYAL TSHAB RJE, he presents this explanation as another logical proof for common *karman*: "... because there is also [an aspect of] that very [aforementioned *karman*], which is common due to an alternative explanation (*rnam grangs=*paryāya*), [*karman*] is, by logical consequence that (i.e. common *karman*). [The proof is:] Beings have accumulated *karman* of a similar kind commonly, and, through the power of that, look at each other, touch and hear each other, and so on, like Devadatta and Yajña (i.e. two different persons). There is no [being] that would not enjoy the fruits of *karman* commonly [with others]. That's why [common *karman* is established by means of logical consequence] (*de nyid rnam grangs kyi dbang gis thun mong bar yang 'gyur ba yod pa'i phyir / der thal / sems can rnams las rigs mthun thun mong ba[r] bsags pa'i stobs kyis lha sbyin dang mchod sbyin lta bu/ phan tshun du blta ba dang / reg pa dang nyan pa sogs las kyi 'bras bu thun mong du spyod par mi 'gyur ba yod pa ma yin pa'i phyir /*, AS-rGyal-tshab, p. 752,5f.)." • $VinSg_{t,P}$ *zi* 8a7-8 (YBh_c 581a29-b4), translated and edited by SCHMITHAUSEN (*Ālayavijñāna*, pp. 491-492, n. 1303): *gzhan yang sems can thams cad ni gcig gi dbang gcig yin pa'i phyir sems can phan tshun 'jug pa'i rtsa ba yang yin te / 'di ltar de las gzhan pa'i sems can gyi mthong ba la sogs pas bde ba dang / sdug bsngal la sogs pa nyams su myong bar mi 'gyur ba gang yin pa'i sems can de* (D: *de dag*) *ni 'ga' yang med pa'i phyir ro //.* "Besides, it (viz.

ālayavijñāna) is also the root of living beings acting upon one another (**anyonya-(pra)vṛtti-mūla*), [such acting upon another having to be accepted] because all living beings influence one another (**itaretarādhipatyāt*). For there is no living being which would not experience pleasure or pain, etc., by perceiving, etc., other living beings (**tathāhi na so 'sti kaścit sattvo yas tadanyasattvadarśādinā sukhaduḥkhādi nānubhavet*, or the like)." The VinSg goes on: **anena paryāyeṇa yaḥ sattvadhātuḥ so 'nyonyādhipateyo veditavyaḥ* (VinSg$_{t,P}$ *zi* 8a8-b1: *rnam grangs des na sems can gyi khams gang yin pa de ni gcig gi dbang gcig yin par rig par bya'o*, = VinSg$_{t,D}$ *zhi* 7a4-5). YBh$_c$ 581a29-b4: 亦是有情互起根本。一切有情相望互爲增上緣故。所以者何。無有有情與餘有情互相見等時。不生苦樂等更相受用。由此道理當知有情界互爲增上緣. This passage has also been edited along with the respective YBh$_c$ text by HAKAMAYA (*Viniścayasaṃgrahaṇī*, p. 37f.). • See also *Viṃśatikākārikā*, verse 18ab: "Through mutual influence there is the reciprocal determining of consciousnesses" (*anyonyādhipatvena vijñaptiniyamo mithaḥ*; *Viṃśatikākārikā*$_{t,P}$ *si* 4a5: *gcig la gcig gi dbang gis na / rnam par rig pa phan tshun nges /*). The *Viṃśatikāvṛtti* 9,21f. comments: "Because all beings are influenced by the consciousness of one another, the consciousness of one another is determined. [This general rule is valid in the individual case] as appropriate" (i.e. according to circumstances, LÉVI, *Deux Traités*, p. 57: "selon l'occurrence"; Skt: *sarveṣāṃ hi sattvānām anyonyavijñaptyādhipatyena mitho vijñapter niyamo bhavati yathāyogam*; *Viṃśatikāvṛtti*$_{t,D}$ *shi* 9a1: *sems can thams cad kyi rnam par rig pa phan tshun gyi dbang gis phan tshun du rnam par rig pa rnams rnam par nges par 'gyur te* (D: *'gyur te*; P: *bya*) */ ci rigs su sbyar ro /*). See FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, pp. 360, 363, 380 and GLASS, "Karma and Yogācāra", p. 30f. • A similar passage in the *Triṃśikā* (also verse 18) mentions mutual influence (*anyonyavaśa*), but its interpretation is more complicated. See SCHMITHAUSEN, "Sautrāntika-Voraussetzungen", p. 132f. • See also the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāgavṛtti*, lines 182-184 (MATHES, *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, pp. 75, 125): "Because they dominate (lit. "because of their being the dominating factor", *bdag po nyid kyis*) each other for the arising (*skye ba*) of consciousness (i.e. a sense perception based on an external object) that appears (*snang*) as that (i.e. as another living beings), [living beings] are the cause for each other. Therefore the world of living beings is called "common" (*phan tshun der snang ba'i rnam par shes pa skye ba la bdag po nyid kyis phan tshun rgyu yin pa'i phyir sems can gyi khams thun mong ba zhes brjod do //*). I am not sure whether my interpretation of the double *phan tshun* is not too strong, but for reasons of time I cannot conduct an in-depth analysis of the ensuing discussion in the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāgavṛtti*, so my translation can only be preliminary. • RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 87, n. 3) understands this subcategory of common *karman* as the mutual relationship between individuals "that influences them one another" (*anyonyadhipatipratyaya*). • MKHAN PO GZHAN DGA': "Moreover there is also a [kind of] *karman* on account of which it has been said that (*zhes brjod pa*) beings (?) arise through their mutual influence (*dbang*). In this way (*'di ltar*): any (*gang*) being that does not happen to interact (*nye bar spyod pa*) with the other beings by means of looking, speaking, touching, and so on mutually, one to one, such a living being does not exist." (*yang gang gis sems can rnams kyi phan tshun gyi dbang gis byung ba zhes brjod pa sems can rnams kyi phan tshun gyi dbang gis 'byung ba'i las kyang yod do* // *'di ltar*

gang sems can gzhan rnams dang phan tshun du gcig la gcig lta ba dang smra ba dang reg pa la sogs pas nye bar spyod par mi 'gyur ba'i sems can de ni yod pa ma yin no //, AS-gZhan 112b1f.). • Concerning common and individual *karman*, MI PHAM does not provide any but the most brief explanations, an almost literal rendering of the AKBh (*yang las thun mong pa snod kyi 'jig rten rnam par 'byed pa / thun min sems can kyi 'jig rten rnam par 'byed pa,* AS-Mi-pham, 458,2). • All those explanations are rather abstract. XUANZANG's **Siddhi* (*Cheng weishi lun* 10c13-17) contains a much more appealing simile: The "common seeds" of each individual being develop into an image of the external world, which is likened the light emitted by many candles. Although each and every candle emits light on its own, those lights cannot be differentiated (when looking at the well-lit objects in the room , I would infer, as the candles themselves stand for the mental continua of the individual beings). See SCHMITHAUSEN, *External World*, p. 35f. The simile is very far developed in its metaphoric impact, even though its applicability to ontological questions is very limited, which is unfortunate, as XUANZANG clearly tries to establish a model according to which there is nothing whatsoever that is not a manifestation of *vijñapti.*

221 The implications of the term *anyonya* in the context of origination in dependence (*pratītyasamutpāda*) have been discussed by SCHMITHAUSEN, "Ethics of Nature", p. 64f., and nn. 183-187. Candrakīrti, in his *Prasannapadā*, uses the term *anyona-saṃśrayena* as well as *paraspara-apekṣā* (dependence on one another) to explain *pratītyasamutpāda.* Here, *anyonya* seems to be equated with *paraspara* and *pratītya*. See NAGAO, *Yogācāra and Madhyamaka*, p. 15. Other usages of *anyonya* in the ASBh are for example:

- ASBh 70,2: *anyonyāsādṛśya* (*phan tshun 'dra ba* [sic]) — different from each other

- ASBh 72,19: *anyonyadāyādatā* (*so so'i bgo skal la spyod pa*) — each receiving his own heritage

- ASBh 73,24: *anyonyair* (*gzhan dang gzhan dag gis*) — through various.... • The term *anyonya* denoting *inter*action, appears in the apocalyptic myth according to which beings attack each other upon sight (*anyonyaṃ sattvaṃ dṛṣṭvā,* AKBh 188,2) when the end of the world is near (see also my notes ad ASBh 63,19-22). That in fact resembles the description of the suffering of animals which generally "devour each other" (*aññamañña-khādikā*, MN III, p. 169, see SCHMITHAUSEN, "Meat-Eating and Nature", p. 184). The parallelism between those two descriptions is obvious and it is clearly seen by contemporary traditional scholars, as I witnessed in a public lecture by CHOS RJE BLA MA DGA' DBANG RIN PO CHE (Bremen 2009), who stated that in those days humans will attack each other, just like the animals do.

222 According to *Cheng weishi lun* 11a8-11, "common seeds" (共相種) are prerequisite for seeing another's body, even if the material faculties (色根) of another exist due to his or her "individual seeds" (不共相種). See SCHMITHAUSEN, *External World*, p. 36-38. This explanation would completely fit in with the ASBh explanations given here, even though these are far less explicit. It is even possible that the ASBh explanation presupposes such an understanding of common *karman* without teaching it.

---

[223] The Tibetan translation literally means "arising (/arisen) through one another's power" or "arising through mutual influence" (*phan tshun gyi dbang gis 'byung* [or *byung*] *ba*, AS_t).

[224] My reconstruction follows $ASVy_t$ (*rnyed par sla ba ma yin*) and AS_c (不易可得) instead of AS_t ([*thun*] *mong ba ma yin*). In my edition of AS_t, I have left *thun mong ba ma yin* for there is no trace of *rnyed par sla* any version of AS_t. Nonetheless, it would be an extremely sloppy translation of *sulabha* (in the sense of "easy to get" = "common"). That equivalent might not go back to an original translator, but rather to a Tibetan reviser who tried to make sense of the Tibetan sentence without taking the Sanskrit original into consideration. See also my notes on NYI MA RGYAL MTSHAN's revision in the introduction, and SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, pp. 492, n. 1303.

[225] The ASVy places these explanations between the AS sentence containing *anyonyādhipateyāḥ sattvāḥ*, and that containing *anyonyadarśanādyupabhoga* (see $ASVy_{t,P}$ 244a4, $ASVy_c$ 710a10-11). As far as I see, *anyonyadarśanādyupabhoga* is a specification of *anyonyādhipateya*, and should thus belongs to the AS section explained by ASBh 67,6-7. Note that, as stated above, the sentence containing *anyonyadarśanādyupabhoga* is considered a sūtra quotation in AS_c 679b28 (dto. $ASVy_c$ 710a11).

[226] $ASBh_{t,P}$ *thun mongs* seems to be an accepted alternate spelling for *thun mong*. See, e.g., *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo*, p. 2036 (entry *sbrel po*).

[227] $ASBh_{t,P}$ *'byung ba* is a more than liberal rendering for *pariṇāma*.

[228] I translate *caittāḥ* (Chin. 心所) as "secondary mental factors" (and not "mental factors") to distinguish them from *citta* (Chin. 心王). *Citta* in the *pañcavastuka* scheme can also be considered a "mental factor", although a primary one. • The ASBh here differs slightly from the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāgavṛtti*, line 182 (MATHES, *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, p. 75). While the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāgavṛtti* speaks only of a perception (*rnam par shes pa*) that arises due to another's influence, the ASBh mentions the secondary mental factors (*caitta*), too. I assume that the *caitta*s are implied in the statement of the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāgavṛtti*, for a certain set of *caitta*s always arises simultaneously with a moment of perception. The reason that the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāgavṛtti* does not mention them is quite surely that they are not considered *the* essential part of subjective experience–the essential part that counts most of all when it is stated that *beings* (*sattvāḥ*) cause one another. The *Dharmadharmatāvibhāgavṛtti* is probably less concerned with a complete Abhidharmic analysis than the ASBh.

[229] The five immediate crimes are considered temporarily obstructive to awakening (see for example AKBh 259,8: *pañcānantaryāṇi karmāvaraṇam*). • On the purification of past deeds, see LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Morale*, pp. 204-214. LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (*op.cit.*, p. 204) states that strict reciprocity would be superficial and immoral. • The notion of counteracting the ripening of *karman* is presented by HEUPERS ("Foundation of Buddhist Ethics", p. 14) as another argument to distinguish the Buddhist *karman* doctrine from

determinism.

230 My reconstruction Skt. *balādhāna* stands for Tib. "the generation [*-*ādhāna*] of power" (*stobs bskyed*). Cf. AS_c "being appropriated and subdued by the power [of...]" (力所攝伏). Cf. MaVyu 1397. BHSD (s.v. *balādhāna*): "attainment of power" (i.e. the gaining of strength) and other equivalents.

231 AS_c 轉成現法受 suggests another reconstruction, such as *dṛṣṭadharmavedanīyaṃ pravartate* or *dṛṣṭadharmavedanīyatvena pravartate*.

232 AS_t *de ltar na* suggests the reconstruction *evam*, but AS_c 所以 makes *yena* preferable.

233 Although the AS_c translation of this sentence is quite accurate, $ASVy_c$ 729a18f. contains AS and ASBh text mixed together in a rather demanding sentence (又故思所造一切善業 望不善業 對治力強 皆名強力). $ASVy_{t,P}$ 244a8-b1 contains both the AS and the ASBh text separately.

234 $ASBh_{MS}$ *[a]kuśalāsyālabdhaṃ*. The vowel length of *akuśalā* is a later addition.

235 Canonical sources: AN V, p. 299f. (in the context of *metta* meditation): *me idaṃ cittaṃ appamāṇaṃ subhāvitaṃ, yaṃ kho pana kiñci pamāṇakataṃ kammaṃ, na taṃ tatrāvasissati, na taṃ tatrāvatiṭṭhati.* SN IV, p. 322: *evam eva kho gāmaṇi evam bhāvitāya mettāya cetovimuttiyā evam bahulīkatāya yam pamāṇakatam kammaṃ na taṃ tatrāvasissati na taṃ tatrāvatiṭṭhati.* See also SĀ 232b4f., SĀ 425b29f., MĀ 438a12ff., ENOMOTO, "Annihilation of karman", p. 47f., and VETTER, *Ideas and Meditative Practices*, p. 90f. • AS-Mi-pham, 458,2-3: "For the Hearer [whose] mind is very trained (*bsgoms pa*) [and therefore?] limitless (*tshad med pa*), the *karman* that has been done to a limited extent (*tshad du byas pa*), that [*karman*] does not lead him, on that [*karman*] those [Hearers] are not to dwell, through that [*karman*] those are not to be counted" (*nyan thos sems shin tu bsgoms pa tshad med pa la / tshad du byas pa'i las des de khrid par mi byed / de la de dag gnas par mi bya'o // des de bgrang bar mi 'gyur ro //*) .

236 AS_c uses the instrumental here: "the one who has perfumed his mind well with a limitless, broad *karman*". "Perfumed" (善熏) here as in Skt. *subhāvita*.

237 Reconstruction *na sa tatrāvastiṣṭhate* also possible.

238 The addition in AS_c (一切善不善業異熟決定。聖道力不斷者。皆名強力業。) is the explanation from the ASBh.

239 These explanations bear some resemblance to the concept of *prahīṇa* as explained at AKBh 322,7.

240 The AS text here partly resembles a VinSg passage that presents six reasons why defilements can be excessive (*chen po nyid*, 上品): 1. *'dod pa nas skyes pa'i nyon mongs pa ni rang bzhin gyis chen po rig par bya ba* etc. (婬欲所生煩惱性多上品), 2. *sngon goms pa* (串習), 3. *gnas la gnas pa* (安足處), which is explained as *dbang po yongs su smin pa rnams* (根熟者), 4. *sgrub tu rung ba* (不可治) which is explained as *yongs su*

mya ngan las mi 'da' ba'i chos can rnams (無涅槃法者), 5. *gnas ma yin pa* (非處加行), which is explained as *bla ma dang sbyin gnas la sogs pa dag la 'jug pa* (於尊重福田等), 6. *kun nas slong ba'i phyir nye bar gnas pa'i nyon mongs pa* (有業煩惱。謂正發業). See AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, pp. 89, 217 (corresponding to $\text{VinSg}_{t,P}$ *zi* 65b7-66a2, YBh_c 603b2-7).

241 The phrase *tad api prakṛtyā balavat* is applied exclusively to the last of the four items (i.e. *asādhyam aparinirvāṇadharmakānāṃ*) in the ASVy_t ($\text{ASVy}_{t,P}$ 244b7). In the AS_c and ASVy_c, *prakṛtyā balavat* is applied to the first of the four (*kāmapratisaṃyuktam akuśalam*) only. In the above-mentioned VinSg passage on the six reasons why defilements can be strong by nature ($\text{VinSg}_{t,P}$ 65b7-66a2), it is equally not clear whether *rang bzhin gyis* is to be applied to all six elements.

242 The implications of the term *padasthaṃ* is are not completely clear ($\text{AS}_{t,P}$ *gnas la gnas pa*; AS_c 依強位, ASVy_c 729a29-b1 處盛年). The explanation of the VinSg passage seem to indicate "standing on one's feet" in the sense of a grown-up person (Chin. "whose faculties are grown", 根熟). Cf. AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 217, n. 189. The classical Chinese term 盛年 (ASVy_c) points to the age when a person is in the prime of health (元気盛んな年ごろ), more specifically "manhood" (壮年), i.e. a person (quite obviously male) in his thirties or forties. See TŌDŌ, MATSUMOTO, and TAKEDA, *Kanjigen*, s.v. 盛年 and 壮年. See also the entry *zhuang* (壮): "a man in his thirties or forties" (三・四十歳の男), also "brave" or "manly" (勇ましい), and "healthy" (元気づける). • RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 88) understands *padastha* as "opportunément", and explains that actions performed while young or in good health are more powerful than those performed during infancy, old age or sickness. Or, to put it in other words, the actions are strong when the agent is strong.

243 The interpretation of *asādhyam* as "cannot be cured" is supported by AS_c (不可治), although AS_t suggests "not to be accomplished" (*bsgrub tu med pa*). For *asādhyā* in AKBh 188,6, AKBh_t translates "not fit to be cured" (*gsor mi rung ba*).

244 Cf. AS-gZhan, fol. 113a4: "because it has no retinue of defilements and secondary defilements" (*nyon mongs dang nye nyon gyi skor med pas*), i.e. misreading *mang* as *med*.

245 This refers to the *icchantika*s (*aparinirvāṇadharmakāṇāṃ icchantikānām*, AS 35,18). RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 88, n. 3). • A passage in the *Śrāvakabhūmi* states that those who are [and will always be] without complete nirvana possess a fundamental kind of "thirst" (called *ālayatṛṣṇā*) which can neither be abandoned (*aprahāṇadharmiṇī*) nor eradicated (*anutsādyā*). Although there are some striking similarities to our AS and ASBh text, *karman* does not play a central role in that *Śrāvakabhūmi* passage, and I do not mean to suggest that *ālaya* has anything to do with *karman* in the sense of a remaining latency there. See SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 165. • The AK mentions acts under the sway of violent defilements or faith, among the acts the ripening of which is determined (*tīvrakleśaprasādena sātatyena ca yat kṛtaṃ guṇakṣetre ca niyatam tat pitror ghātakam ca yat*, AK IV.54, AKBh 231,22).

[246] Cf. $ASVy_{t,P}$ 244b8: *zhing dang ma gsod* (D: *bsod*) *pa la sogs pa'o // sems kyi mngon par 'du byed pas kyang....* The phrasing of the $ASVy_t$ is jumbled and hard to follow for the Tibetan reader. See my notes on the $ASVy_t$ text in the introduction.

[247] YBh parallel: Also YBh 187,14 mentions *karman* from the point of view of *cittābhisaṃskāras*, but the explanation differs from the ASBh: *tatrābhisaṃskārataḥ / yathāpīhaikatyas tīvreṇa lobhadveṣamohaparyavasānena tīvreṇa vālobhādveṣāmohābhisaṃskāreṇa karma samutthāpayati //.*

[248] YBh parallel: YBh 188,3-4: *tatra vastutaḥ / yathāpīhaikatyo buddhe vā saṅghe vānyatamānyatam asmin vā gurusthānīye vastuni gurukavastukam evāpakāraṃ vā prayuṅkte //.*

[249] I translate *śīla* as "discipline" in the context of this study. According to SCHMITHAUSEN ("Bodhisattva-Ethik", p. 21), *śīla* has to be understood as "[correct, faultless] behaviour" ("[korrekte, einwandfreie] Verhaltensweisen") in Buddhist usage. The term most commonly used on secondary literature is "morality" (e.g. SCHMITHAUSEN, "Weiteres Fragment aus dem Prakaraṇa", p. 63: "Sittlichkeit").

[250] On the definition of *manasikāra* (or, *manaskāra*), see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 468f., n. 6. DELEANU discusses possible equivalents for *manaskāra* in the context of meditation for which I may propose "[sustained] attention" here.

[251] This phrase probably means that two or more of the *puṇyakriyavastu* (BHSD, s.v.) play a role in the action simultaneously, e.g. giving and discipline. $ASBh_t$: "is embraced by another object of meritorious deeds." $ASVy_c$ 729b13-14: "Furthermore, one practices another object of meritorious action widely, so that they are embraced together (?)" (更廣修習餘福業事共相攝受。).

[252] I present the AS phrase on weak *karman* after the ASBh explanations on the nine kinds of strong *karman*. This order of arrangement is in accordance with $ASVy_c$ 729b16. Note however that $ASVy_t$ 245a1-2 places this AS sentence *before* the ASBh explanations.

[253] My arrangement of the following section (AS 56,9-57,2) does not follow ASVyt,P 245a6-246a5. I have placed all AS text *before* the respective explanations in the ASBh. • Canonical sources: The sūtra quotation corresponds to AN I, p. 249: *yo bhikkhave evaṃ vadeyya: yathā yathāyaṃ puriso kammaṃ karoti tathā tathā taṃ paṭisaṃvediyatīti / evaṃ santaṃ bhikkhave brahmacariyavāso na hoti okāso na paññāyati sammā dukkhassa antakiriyāya / yo ca kho bhikkhave evaṃ vadeyya / yathā yathā vedanīyaṃ ayaṃ puriso kammaṃ karoti tathā tathāssa vipākaṃ paṭisaṃvediyatīti. evaṃ santaṃ bhikkhave brahmacariyavāso hoti okāso paññāyati sammā dukkhassa antakiriyāya.* MĀ 433a14-17 (sūtra no. 11): 世尊告諸比丘。隨人所作業則受其報。如是。不行梵行不得盡苦。若作是說。隨人所作業則受其報。如是。修行梵行便得盡苦. • A Sanskrit fragment referring to the same sūtra passage has been discussed by SCHMITHAUSEN, "Fragments of an Early Commentary", p. 252f. In order to substantiate my reconstruction, I provide the fragmentary passage edited by SCHMITHAUSEN (art. cit., p. 253) along with its AS parallel below:

AS 56,9-11	*Early Commentary*
ya evaṃ vaded	*yo bhikṣavaḥ evaṃ vadeyā*
yathā yathāyaṃ puruṣapudgalaḥ karma	*yathā yathā kar[ma]*
evaṃ sati	*evaṃ sati*
brahmacaryavāso	*brahmacaryyavāso*
na bhavaty	*na bhavati,*
avakāśaś	*avakāśo*
na prajñāyate	*na prajñāyati*

254 The term *brahmacarya* classically denotes the state of an young *veda* student living in the house of his *guru*. It implies a set of rules, with a strong focus on chastity (cf. Latin *castus*), upon which the Buddhist monastic rules were modelled. I usually translate *brahmacarya-/vas* as "living the life of an ascetic" for lack of a better equivalent, but depending on the context, also as "observing celibacy", thereby losing the important component *brahma*. On the *brahmacarya* rules, see OBERLIES, "Geschichte der buddhistischen Ordensregeln". See also below, AS 60,12-13.

255 The meaning of this passage is simply that it is not relevant whether an action is pleasant, unpleasant or neutral for it to be wholesome (in the sense of bringing fourth a pleasant result) or unwholesome. What counts is its value from the point of view of *karman* doctrine, i.e. its being wholesome, unwholesome or neutral. Not only do parts of this passage appear stylistically dull (i.e. in a very mechanistic *mātṛka* style), there are also a few irregularities in the Tibetan and Chinese translations, as well as in the ASVy text. For reasons of time I cannot provide a complete analysis here. • See also SCHMITHAUSEN, "Bodhisattva-Ethik", p. 37f.

256 ASBh$_{MS}$ has no *daṇḍa* after *śīlaparipālanāt* (reading *śīlaparipālanād yadi*). The *daṇḍa* is missing in the same place in ASBh$_{t}$.

257 The syntax of the original Sanskrit sentence is unclear. It might also read *pratiṣiddho 'tra bhagavatā....*

258 Skt. *anujñātaḥ* here authoritatively expresses the exclusive accuracy of the statement thus "admitted". See CPD, s.v. *anuññāta*. • XUANZANG adds a phase in the AS$_{c}$, distinguishing the preceding wrong ideas from the correct theory that follows: "And also to allow (爲開許) the following correct explanation ... " (故作是說。又爲開許如是正說。). As the explanations of the AS are difficult to follow, the purpose of his addition was probably just to add some ordering element.

259 It seems contradictory at first sight that also neutral feelings ("neither pleasure nor suffering") result from wholesome *karman*, but here this does not refer to ordinary states which are neither particularly pleasant or painful, but to the states beyond pleasure or

suffering, which are the result of the wholesome *āniñjya* actions above the third *dhyāna* (see AS 58,13-14). ▪ A definition of *aduḥkhāsukhavedanīyasyaṃ karma* is provided in the *Savitarkādibhūmi*: It is a.) that which ripens as the *ālayavijñāna*, and b.) *karman* that leads to immovability (YBh 192,6-9: *aduḥkhāsukhavedanīyaṃ karma yat sarvatrālaya-vijñānavaipākyaṃ karma, caturtac ca dhyānād ūrdhvam āniñjyam/*). See SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, pp. 134-136.

260 The ASBh MS is not absolutely clear, but both *evaṃdyathā* as well as *evaṃmyathā* would be unacceptable. There is not equivalent to *vaded* in $ASBh_t$, but it should be noted that in the previous passage (ASBh 67,25-26, where $ASBh_{MS}$ contains *vadet*) $ASBh_t$ misplaces *zhes zer ba* as if it would refer to the whole sūtra passage. Actually *vaded* refers only to the idea that is brought forth (*sukha* leads to *sukha*, and so on) and not to its interpretation ("asceticism would be futile", and so on). In the current sentence (ASBh 68,9-12) such an interpretation is missing. • An equivalent to *yas tv evaṃ [vaded] yathāvedanīyaṃ yathāvedanīyam ity evamādinā* is missing in both $ASVy_c$ and $ASVy_t$.

261 This phrase is missing in both $ASBh_t$ and $ASVy_t$.

262 In Jainism, the term *saṃvara* means sealing off the subtle body against the inflow (*āsrava*) of karmic matter. HALBFASS, *Karma und Wiedergeburt*, pp. 69, 76. • Although I consider the translation "vow" for *saṃvara* unproblematic (see also TATZ, *Chapter on Ethics*, p. 8) it seemed advisable to stick with the more literal equivalent "restraint" because this section contains etymological explanations like *°saṃvarasaṃvṛta* (AS 60,3-4). Nonetheless, the semantic aspect is prevalent in the expression *asaṃvara*, i.e. being bound to do unwholesome acts (see below). • On *saṃvara*, see also SCHMITHAUSEN, "Weiteres Fragment aus dem Prakaraṇa", p. 63f.

263 A non-restraint (*asaṃvara*) is the negative version of a restraint: people bound (or, "restrained") by oath, profession, or descent to do unwholesome acts. This is of course a Buddhist perspective. Others may regard the discipline of a warrior, for example, the highest of all virtue, or the strict observance of regular animal sacrifice. Still others reject any code of ascetic behaviour (as alluded to in the above sūtra quotation, AS 56,7-9), which would, so to speak, make the Buddhist monastic vow an *asaṃvara* from their perspective. • I opted to translate this term as "non-restraint" instead of "bad restraint", even though it implies the *presence* of a commitment: It is clearly not the absence of a *saṃvara*. Still, "bad restraint" would neglect the more decent style of the Sanskrit negation, so I would like to ask the reader to understand "non-restraint" as "a restraint which is not a restraint in the Buddhist sense." Similar problems arise in the translation of "bad discipline" (*dauḥśīlya*), where "corrupted discipline" would be a rendering more faithful to the meaning, but less literal. The discipline of a monk engaging in *dauḥśīlya* may still be "good", so to speak, in many respects. It is not the discipline which is bad *per se*. • The Buddhist doctrine of intentionality would require a deliberate decision to take an oath if that oath was to have a karmic effect (commitment to a certain profession, for example). Still, AS 58,3-7 explicitly states that one can be a person of non-restraint "due to one's birth" (*abhijanmatas*). It seems that the AS author considered certain professions as "non-restraint", and that his mention of non-restraint "due to one's birth" was meant to pre-empt objections that many of those persons had never taken an oath. This AS doctrine

vaguely resembles the doctrine of *agotraka*, which does not appear in the AS. At least the term *agotraka* was not always received without reservations (see GUENTHER, *Jewel Ornament*, p. 12, n. 21). ▪ A question I cannot answer here is *why* certain professions were classified as *asaṃvara*, since, to my knowledge, among the *asaṃvara* persons only thieves were denied monastic ordination (see KIEFFER-PÜTZ, "Buddhistische Gemeinde", p. 373). Still, that varied depending on time and region. As I was told by a local informant, novice ordination in Ladakh included a declaration that they are not the son of a blacksmith. There were probably limits to the *openness* the Buddhist order could afford without being shunned by society, and there were surely limits to the *restrictiveness* the Buddhist order could afford, too, since, for example, soldiers are not mentined in the *asaṃvara* list. Note also that the term which seems refer to shepherds is translated as "sheep butcher" into Tibetan, while the person rearing pigs is more literally referred to as "living on pigs", as I will discuss below, ad AS 58,3-7. The reasons for this are not absolutely clear, but the early translators possibly did not want to make a huge part of the population *asaṃvara*. ▪ The original intention of the *asaṃvara* list was possibly to encourage Buddhist layfollowers to avoid those professions. See SCHMITHAUSEN, "Ethics of Nature", p. 53, n. 138.

264 Note that XUANZANG repeats his translation of *karmaprabheda* (業差別) in his additional explanations below, AS 58,10-11, AS 58,15-16, AS 59,5-6. He presupposes a superstructure according to which those passages introduce various kinds of *karmaprabheda*. XUANZANG always mentions the number of items contained: "Moreover (又) [as for] the division of *karman* (業差別) there are three kinds (有三種)" (又業差別有三種), etc.

265 Cf. AKBh 205,15 (AK IV.13): *saṃvaraḥ prātimokṣakhyo dhyānajo 'nāsravas tathā*, and YBh 191,6f.

266 My reconstruction follows AS_t *ris brgyad* (=$ASVy_t$, parallel to AKBh 207,23, *aṣṭau nikāyāḥ*) and not AS_c 七衆 (=$ASVy_c$ 730a10). XUANZANG's translation would fit to an original **saptanaikāyikaḥ*, parallel to *Śrāvakabhūmi* 37,14. He seems to count the seventh and eighth restraints as one (鄔波斯迦律儀及近住律儀). • Whether seven or eight groups are listed basically depends on whether the sets of vows (eight) are to be described, or the persons (normally seven groups) observing those. The eighth item is the set of fasting restraints. Lay followers are still counted as such, even while they are observing the fasting restraints. See JINAPUTRA (*Byang chub sems dpa'i tshul khrims*, fol. 194a): "[The Bodhisattvabhūmi] states 'the seven classes', because, based on the seven classes [of persons observing the vows, the Prātimokṣa] is to be divided (*phye ba*) into seven classes. From the point of view of [its] appearance, [the Prātimokṣa] becomes eightfold, because the *upavāsasaṃvara* is distinguished as a separate one as it has a special (*tha dad pa*) appearance" (*ris bdun po zhes bya ba smos te ris bdun po la brten nas / ris bdun gyis phye ba'i phyir ro // rnam pas rnam pa tha dad pas ni bsnyen te gnas* [read: *bsnyen gnas te bsnyen gnas pa'i*?] *pa'i sdom pa logs shig tu phye ba'i phyir rnam pa brgyad du 'gyur ba'i phyir ro //*). See also lists of eight in AKBh 205,18 [AK IV.14a]: *aṣṭadhā prātimokṣākhyaḥ, Xianyang shengjiao lun* 554a24: 八衆所受別解脫戒. Seven

groups of persons are mentioned in *Śrāvakabhūmi* 37,14 (CHOI, *Dreifache Schulung*, p. 149): *saptanaikāyikam śīlaṃ pratimokṣasaṃvara ity ucyate* (YBh$_c$ 402a28-29: 七衆所受別解脱律儀), *Bodhisattvabhūmi* 96,10 (read): *saptanaikāyikaṃ*. ▪ The issue was not completely uncontested among Buddhist scholars: *Samudramegha (or *Sāgaramegha?) considered it acceptable to include the fasting restraint (*upavāsasaṃvara*) in the list of seven, at the expense of that of the trainee nun (*śikṣamāṇāsaṃvara*), which he would like to consider as a special case of the nun's restraint (*bhikṣuṇīsaṃvara*). This is rejected by Tsong kha pa. See TATZ, *Chapter on Ethics*, p. 105. There are in fact various discussions about the categorization of the eight groups and the persons observing those restraints (see for example LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Abhidharmakośa*, vol. 3, p. 43f.). • Based on the Chinese, PRADHAN retranslates *sapta*, followed by RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 90). In support of his reading RAHULA, lists seven categories of restrictions from the "*Pātimokkha*" (*pārājika, saṅgādisesa, ..., ibid.*, n. 1). For those seven, see the chapter *Major Rule Groups of the Patimokkha* in BHIKKHU ARIYESAKO, *Bhikkhus' Rules* (unpaginated). RAHULA (loc. cit.) also refers a list of the five transgressions (*āpatti*) in the MSA. All this has, as far as I can see, little to do with the list of eight Prātimokṣa restraints in the AS.

267 On the tern *kāmaviveka*, see *Śrāvakabhūmi*, pp. 449,15-450,2 • VinSg$_{t,D}$ 31b1-5 explains those three kinds of restraint to the same effect: They were devised by the Buddha for those who refrain from 1. both bad conduct and desire (*bhikṣu*), 2. bad conduct but not desire (*upāsaka*), and 3. neither of both (*upavāsa*).

268 The confusion of *brtags* and *btags* occurs frequently in the *bstan 'gyur*. ERB, *Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti*, p. 119, n. 179.

269 Partial lay discipline would be practiced by a layman who observes the lay restraints during a limited time span, or with regard to certain beings only. A Buddhist legend tells the tale of a butcher who would observe the vow not to kill, but only during the night, while following his profession during the day. In his next life, he would have to endure the torments of hell during the day while living in a pleasurable palace at night. See RDZA DPAL SPRUL, *Kun bzang bla ma'i zhal lung*, p. 185. On partial lay discipline, see also LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Morale*, p. 46f. • RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 90f.) misunderstood this passage to the effect that laypeople residing in monasteries are a danger for morality: "A l'égard de quelques disciples laïcs qui sejournent dans un établissement monastique (*śikṣāsthāna*), elle (cette discipline) est appelée l'accompagnement (*samanvāgama*); la discipline d'un disciple laïc est appelée non-accompagnement (*asamanvāgam*), et le dit accompagnement est aussi appellé danger pour la moralité (*śīlavipatti*), comme dans le cas des hermaphrodites et des eunuques." As I could observe during a visit to Bankok, Thai monasteries do accommodate laymen, often students from the countryside, and one can imagine that problems for the monastic discipline may ensue (late meals, music, etc.). RAHULA does not specify in how far hermaphrodites and eunuchs would endanger monastic discipline, but it seems that he is primarily concerned about sexual seduction. Such issues, however, are only addressed in the following AS passage.

270 On the issue of sexual divergence in Buddhism, see HARVEY, *Buddhist Ethics*, pp.

411-434 ("Homosexuality and Other Forms of 'Queerness'"). For the more general Indian context, see SYED, "Das dritte Geschlecht", and GYATSO, "One Plus One". See also SCHMITHAUSEN, "Bodhisattva-Ethik", p. 25f., n. 16. • The following AS passage corresponds to $\text{VinSg}_{t,P}$ *zi* 36a5ff. (= YBh_c 591b28-c15) and $\text{VinSg}_{t,P}$ *zi* 38a5 (=YBh_c 592b11-23). See also AKVy 94,17-95,4. • BU STON's comment on the implications of transsexuality sounds rather drastic: "When one has died or become a transvestite, one gives up [the vows] because one has given up the body, and the base (*rten*) is damaged" (*shi ba dang ma ning du gyur na / lus bor zhing rten nyams pas gtong ngo //*, AS-Bu-ston, p. 550,1). • Although speaking of gender issues in the context of the restraints, neither AS nor ASBh directly address the issue of sex change, which has been discussed in other sources. See, e.g. SAKUMA, *Āśrayaparivṛtti*, vol. 1, p. 90f., and vol. 2, p. 182.

[271] As in the case of the *napuṃsaka*, the exact meaning of these terms is difficult to determine. I suspect that the ideas about the *ṣaṇḍhapaṇḍaka* remained vague, or even mythical to some extent. ASBh 68,21-23 (see below) explains that the hermaphrodites (*ubhayavyañjanānām*) were not mentioned in the AS ("separately" *pṛthak*) because it can be explained through common sense that they are not appropriate to "wait upon" monks and nuns. The other possibility is that the AS author thought they were included among the *ṣaṇḍhapaṇḍakāḥ*, or at least that the mention of *ṣaṇḍhapaṇḍakāḥ* would as *pars pro toto* also imply other kinds of sexual divergence. • From $\text{YBh}_{t,P}$ *zi* 37a8-b4, it seems that *ṣaṇḍha* refers to impotent men, while *paṇḍaka* is used for a broad range of sexually divergent people. My translation as "eunuch" is of a preliminary nature. For one, I think the concept is rather vague, partially mythical. It is also possible that they are considered impotent on the base that they are unfit for heterosexual intercourse. Cf. FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 55: "nicht Weib, nicht Mann, nicht der Eunuch" (translation from the *Śalistambasūtra*). • RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 91) translates *ṣaṇḍhapaṇḍaka* as "des hermaphrodites et des eunuques", but explains the *napuṃsakapaṇḍaka* to be a hermaphrodite (!) who is either impotent or does not have a distinct sexual organ. That suggests that RAHULA's terminology is not based on precise definitions. Cf. also BHIKKHU ARIYESAKO, *Bhikkhus' Rules* (unpaginated) where *paṇḍaka* is translated as "sex-aberrant". • AKBh 220,6 states that *ṣaṇḍhapaṇḍaka* are not subject to restraint or non-restraint. According to the AKBh, being "furnished with the male organ" (*puruṣendriyeṇa samanvāgataḥ*, AKBh 226,11) is a sign that one is not a *ṣaṇḍhapaṇḍaka*.

[272] The word "waiting upon" (*upāsana*) clearly alludes to the word for "lay follower" (*upāsaka*), which derives from the same verb (*upa-√ās*). It would of course be interesting to know from which aspects of religious life sexually divergent people were expected to keep away, e.g. whether monks accepted their alms or not. • Note that although both, monks and nuns are mentioned, the discussion is not extended to the status of a female lay follower (**upāsikātva*).

[273] In the context of *kleśa* doctrine, *samudācāra* means the actual occurrence of the defilements. See AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 259, and AS 35,15ff. • On the defilements of hermaphrodites, see also LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Morale*, p. 234.

[274] It is noteworthy that the ASBh does not provide any explanations here. • Various

kinds of sexually divergent are people are mentioned in MaVyu. 8768-8775. • RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 91, n. 1) refers to a description of the five kinds of "eunuchs" in the Vinaya commentary *Samantapāsādikā*, p. 187 (p. 1015f in the PTS edition). For the *āsittapaṇḍaka* mentioned there the *Kāmasūtra* contains a detailed explanation. For a more recent discussion, see THANISSARO BHIKKHU, *Buddhist Monastic Code* (unpaginated), "Chapter Five: Sanghadisesa".

275 See MaVyu 8769.

276 See MaVyu 8772.

277 See MaVyu 8770, and AKVy 94,20.

278 See MaVyu 9560. Cf. AKVy 94,21: *āsekapaṇḍaka*.

279 See MaVyu 8773.

280 The AS here describes how the adept counteracts those latent defilements that may one day become acute and lead to unwholesome actions opposed to Buddhist discipline (I neglect here that inactivity, e.g., failure to take part in the confession ceremony, can be considered unwholesome). The VinSg is a bit more explicit about how he "damages" (*upa-/han*) those latencies ("seeds", *bīja*) through his practice of tranquillity meditation and his ascent through the various stages of concentration, damaging the seeds further and further: "If [someone has taken up the restraints of discipline, and then], based on that very faultless taking up of the restraints, by means of (*rgyus*) of freedom from remorse, enters into the concentration (*nyoms par 'jug*, **samāpadyate*) as far as the first absorption, and damages the seeds of corrupt discipline through the damaging [force of his] tranquillity [meditation, **śamatha*], *that* is the restraint of absorption. In just the same way it is with the first absorption, it has to be understood [accordingly] also for the second, third and fourth absorptions. The difference [in quality between those stages of the restraints of absorption] is as follows: One damages the seeds of corrupt discipline more [and more] vigorously (*ches shin tu*) through that path of tranquillity [meditation] which is included in the "antidote that creates distance" (grammatically, *thag ring du*, "[makes them] far away", is in the *de nyid* case here). It has to be understood that his restraints are [then] pure through the first [kind of] purity. (*gal te sdom pa yang dag par blangs pa skyon med pa de nyid la brten nas 'gyod pa med pa'i rgyus bsam gtan dang po'i bar la snyoms par 'jug cing tshul khrims 'chal ba'i sa bon zhi gnas kyis nyams par byed pas nyams par byed pa de ni de'i bsam gtan gyi sdom pa yin te / bsam gtan dang po ji lta ba de bzhin du gnyis pa dang gsum pa dang bzhi pa yang de bzhin du rig par bya'o // bye brag ni 'di yod de de (D: de de; P: de) tshul khrims 'chal pa'i sa bon thag ring du bya ba'i* (*ba'i*; PD: *ba de*. This a tentative conjecture against the two Tibetan versions I have consulted. It is supported by supported by YBh$_c$ 由遠分對治所 and "*dūrībhāvaprati-pakṣeṇa*" in our corresponding ASBh passage) *gnyen pos yongs su zin pa'i (D: pa'i; P pa) zhi gnas kyi lam gyis ches shin tu nyams par byed pa ste / de ni yongs su dag pa dang pos de'i sdom pa yongs su dag pa yin par rig par bya'o //*, VinSg$_{t,P}$ *zi* 33b1-4, VinSg$_{t,D}$ *zhi* 30b7-31a2, corresponds to YBh$_c$ 590b23-29)." The VinSg passage continues with a description of the "restraint without outflow", translated below.

[281] Skt. *vītarāga* is a common expression in Buddhist soteriology designating someone who is "free from passion", or "detached." The character of a person detached from the objects of sensual desire are described in quite non-technical terms at ŚrBh 469,12-470,1: he perceives the visible objects with his eyes, hears sounds, and so on, but has no passion for them. See DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, pp. 354 and 466. According to NYANATILOKA (*Aus der Angereihten Sammlung*, vol. IV, p. 186, n. 63), the Aṅguttara-Nikāya commentary states that such a freedom from passion can be achieved either by having "cut off" the passions (Pāli: *samucchinna-rāgassa*) by means of the path, or otherwise by having blocked (*vikkhambita*) them by means of meditative attainment. The first process, "cutting off" corresponds to the "complete eradication" (*samudghāta*, see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 509, n. 114) of the AS, on which see below. A similar distinction is made at ASBh 99,4-6: On the mundane path (*laukikamārga*) the adept blocks (*viṣkhambhaṇa*) the acute outbreaks (*paryavasthānāḥ*) of the defilements (by practicing tranquility meditation successfully AB). On the supramundane path (*lokottaramārga*), the adept completely eradicates (*samudghāta*) even the dormant potentialities (*anuśaya*s) for future outbreaks of the defilements (by a practice that lets him go through the Path of Seeing AB). The issue is slightly complicated by the fact that the term used for "damaging" seeds in the ASBh, *upaghāta*, seems to stand for the destruction of *karman* in the *Visuddhimagga* (see SCHMITHAUSEN, *Buddhism and Nature*, p. 9f., n. 52). • The action performed by the latent defilement is in this ASBh passage "continuing, lingering on" (*anubaddha*) is, according to traditional interpretative etymology (*nirukti*) the characteristic function of dormant potentialities (*anuśaya*s, see AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśa*s*, p. 30). This aspect of latency is also expressed in another *nirukti* which understands it as "sleeping in the way of an imprint", *bag chags kyi tshul du nyal ba* (whence the Tibetan expression "*bag nyal*"). See ISHIKAWA, sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa, p. 92. See also AHN, *op.cit.*, pp. 28-32, for a detailed explanation of the term.

[282] According to the VinSg, the one who is immersed in one of the *dhyāna*s is at that time free from the passions of the *kāmadhātu* (*kāma-vītarāga*), which are harmful intent (*vyāpāda*) and a passion for sensual pleasures (*kāmarāga*), as well as "that conceit (*māna*) that comes along with them." Those passions may occur again after he has arisen from the absorption, but not when he is reborn in one of the *dhyāna* realms. See AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśa*s*, pp. 125f. and 304f.

[283] Note that the AS here refers to defilements in their latent form as "the seeds of the defilements", a term known, e.g., from the VinSg (see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 177).

[284] I constantly read *bral ba'i* against *bral bas* in AS_t and $ASVy_t$. The genitive is clearly attested in AS_c "The separation of the one who has severed himself from the desire to the desire realm" (離欲界欲者所有遠離). Still, taking the Skt. genitive as *genitivus subjectivus* and rendering it with a Tib. instrumental is not wrong. I had not changed the AS_t reading *bral bas* would $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$ not read *bral ba'i* once below. That makes me assume that *bral bas* does not go back to the original translators, but I am by no means sure. The instrumental is found in Tibetan commentaries, such as AS-dPang-lo, fol. 239b6f. and AS-Bu-ston, p. 539,4.

[285] Or, for *bījopaghāte sati*, reconstruct *bījopaghāte*? The word *sati* may be an explanatory element in the ASBh.

[286] Or, for *kāmebhyo vītarāgasya*, reconstruct *kāmavītarāgasya*?

[287] An equivalent to *pradeśavairāgyeṇāpi* (ASBh$_t$ *phyogs gcig pa las 'dod chags dang bral ba nyid du zad de*; ASVy$_c$ 730b11 或少分離欲或全分離欲) is missing in all versions of ASVy$_t$. • In his summary of this passage DPANG LO includes an equivalent to *pradeśavairāgyeṇāpi*–a clear indication that DPANG LO neither advocates an omission of that phrase, nor did he rely on any text that would omit it, such as the revised ASVy$_t$: "As for the restraint of absorption, there are three [topics]. Among [those] the [topic] 'object' (*dngos po*) [is as follows]: 'From (*nas*) the abandonment taking place when the seeds for the defilements and secondary defilements of the realm of desire, [which are] the cause of corrupt discipline, are overcome through the antidote that completely subdues (*rnam par gnon pa'i gnyen po*) [them], even by becoming free from attachment to a part of [the realm of] sensual pleasures, up to (*bar*) the abandonment through the antidote that creates distance (*ring du byed pa'i gnyen po*) [in the case] of the one who has become free from attachment to the third level of absorption'" (*bsam gtan gyi sdom pa la gsum las dngos po ni 'chal ba'i tshul khrims kyi rgyu 'dod khams kyi nyon mongs dang nye ba'i nyon mongs kyi sa bon rnam par gnon pa'i gnyen pos 'joms na 'dod pa las phyogs gcig la 'dod chags dang bral bas kyang spong ba nas gsum pa las* (*las*; AS-dPang-lo: *la*) *chags bral gyi bar gyi* (*gyi*; AS-dPang-lo: *gyis*) *ring du byed pa'i gnyen pos spong ba'o //*, AS-dPang-lo, fol. 239b4-6).

[288] The phrasing at ASVy$_c$ 730b12 is slightly different: 離初二三靜慮欲者. • "The antidote [leading to the] becoming far away [of the defilements]" means in this context that the "seeds" that were first blocked are now removed further and further away from the adept. The "antidote that blocks" the defilements is likened to a pillar (*skambha*) the adept places between himself and the defilements so that they cannot reach him, at least temporarily. The *dūrībhāva-pratipakṣa*, then, is a device by which he pushes them further and further away. According to ASBh 83,23f., the *dūrībhāva-pratipakṣa* creates distance to the defilements "that have previously been given up" (*pūrvaprahīṇa*) . That, nonetheless, does not mean that *dūrībhāva-pratipakṣa* corresponds only to the supramundane Path of Meditation (*bhāvanāmārga*), where the adept, having completely eradicated the unwholesome defilements during the Path of Seeing, advances on the path, leaving those defilements further and further behind. It also applies to the mundane Path of Meditation, where the adept gains more and more distance, having only temporarily "blocked" the defilements. This is made clear at AKVy 687,16-18 (***prahīṇadūrīkāraṇāc*** *ceti* [...] *laukikair lokottarair vā mārgair* [...] *kleśopakleśā dūrīkriyante*), while VinSg$_{t,D}$ 224b7 goes even further, stating that the *dūrībhāva-pratipakṣa* applies *only* to the mundane Path of Meditation (*'jig rten pa'i bsgom pa'i lam ni thag bsring ba['i] gnyen po yin no*). There are more open questions to this issue, but a further analysis would be beyond the scope of this study. See also SAKUMA, *Āśrayaparivṛtti*, vol. 2, p. 176f., AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 282f., MAITHRIMURTHI, *Vier* apramāṇas, p. 203, n. 60, DELHEY, *Samāhitā Bhūmiḥ*, p. 159, ad MS 68b4, YBh$_c$ 333a2, and DELHEY, *op.cit.*, p. 41, n. 111..

• To put it more concretely: While the adept is in a meditative trance, he can not be hateful or desirous, and through continued practice, he gets more and more estranged from such outbreaks. Still, that is an explanation in terms of contemporary common sense and it makes a strict distinction between a.) "blocking" (*viṣkambha*) emotional/mental outbreaks of the *anuśaya*s and b.) "[leading to their] becoming far away" (*dūrībhāva*) rather artificial and unnecessary, and probably rightly so. It seems that there were merely systematical reasons for that distinction: The "restraints of absorption" were believed to be material, wherefore they could not exist in the divine realm without matter (*ārūpyadhātu*, on which see below, ad ASBh 68,27-28).

289 I assume that the sDe-dge editors basically understood *rnam par gzhag pa* as a noun, while they preferably used *rnam par bzhag pa* to render the *ppp vyavasthāpita* and any finite past-tense forms of *vy-ava-/sthā*. See CHOI, *Index zum Hsien-yang shêng-chiao lun*, s.v. *vyavasthāna*, DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 38, n. 22 and p. 177, ERB, *Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti*, p. 95, YOKOYAMA and HIROSAWA, *Kanbonzō*, s.v. 安立, but cf. NAGAO, ed., *Index to Asaṅga's Mahāyānasaṃgraha*, s.v. *rnam par gzhag pa bsam gyis mi khyab pa*, and *rnam par bzhag pa*. As I state in the introduction, the reading *rnam par gzhag pa* may stemmatically be a correction on the part of the sDe-dge editors and not the original reading of the archetype above PNGDC. Ad $KSi_{t,P}$ 161a2, MUROJI (*Jōgōron*, p. 19) reads *rnam par gzhag pa* with DC against PN *rnam par bzhag pa*. I am not sure whether that expression stands for *vyavasthāpita* or *vyavasthāna*, and in the latter case, if *rnam par gzhag pa* was the original reading. The verb *gzhag* seems to be quite problematic for similar issues occur in the case of *mnyam par bzhag pa* for Skt. *samāhita*. DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 366, n. 123), referring to DELHEY ("Samāhitā Bhūmiḥ") relates that $YBh_{t,D}$ preferably reads *mnyam par bzhag* pa, while $YBh_{t,P}$ *prefers mnyam par gzhag pa*, even though the D editors did not proceed in an absolutely coherent way. DELEANU (*ibid.*) prefers *mnyam par bzhag pa* in order to render the past participle, and I follow the same rule of thumb with some uncertainty. On Skt. *samāhita*, see also DELHEY (*Samāhitā Bhūmiḥ*, p. 28f., n. 77).

290 The restraint of absorption is, according to *Mahāvibhāṣā* 621c26f. (靜慮律儀者謂色界尸羅), the discipline (*śīla*) of the material realm (*rūpadhātu*). This doctrine is also found at AKBh 205,16f. (*dhyānasaṃvaro rūpāvacaraṃ śīlam*). Anyone who is immersed in one of the four absorptions of the *rūpadhātu*–or those intermediate states of meditation which belong to them–is furnished with (*samanvāgata*) the restraint of absorption (see AKBh 208,4-7, ad AK IV.17b), but only as long as he is immersed, not after he has arisen from the absorption. See AKBh 210,3: *na tu vyutthit[aḥ]*, RYŌSE, *Abhidharmahṛdaya*, p. 86 and T 1550, p. 813b15-24, and SCHMITHAUSEN, "Weiteres Fragment aus dem Prakaraṇa", p. 63f. ▪ The ASBh here advocates that very same doctrine, according to which restraints are a kind of matter. It is the *avijñapti*, which is invisible, offers no resistance to touch, and therefore belongs to the *dharmāyatana*. Certain aspects of that doctrine were debated between Vasubandhu and Saṅghabhadra, mostly its role in the ripening of *karman*. It should be noted that the AS does not touch upon that issue here. In fact, it is not really essential for a Buddhist practitioner, since wrongly believing that there is *dhyānasaṃvara* in the immaterial realms would not make anyone a bad Buddhist.

It might, nonetheless, make him a mediocre scholar, wherefore the ASBh is more explicit, alluding to the *avijñaptirūpa* which is basically accepted in several Yogācāra treatises. For example, AS 4,13 mentions a kind of matter (*rūpa*) that is "taking up" (*samādāna*) and belongs to the *dharmāyatana*. ASBh 4,4 comments that "*samādāna-[rūpa]* is *avijñaptirūpa*" (see also RAHULA, *Compendium*, p. 5, n. 4), and one may safely assume that that matches the intention of the AS author. ▪ Also DPANG LO states: "Because there is no matter in the immaterial realm, there is no restraint that has its nature" (*gzugs med na gzugs med pas de'i ngo bo can gyi sdom pa med do*, AS-dPang-lo, fol. 239b6). That, he explains, is in accordance with Vaibhāṣika doctrine (*'di ni bye brag smra ba dang sgo bstun pa, ibid.*, see AKBh 201,8: *ārūpyeṣu nāsti bhūtābhāvāt*). And BU-STON's rephrasing presupposes that restraints are matter: "'After one has become free from attachment to the fourth [*dhyāna*], there is no matter in the immaterial realm. Therefore, there is no restraint.' Thus [it is taught] in the [AS-]commentary." (*bzhi pa las 'dod chags dang bral nas gzugs med na gzugs med pa'i phyir sdom pa med ces 'grel bar ro/*, AS-Bu-ston, p. 539,5-6). In the same vein, XUANZANG translates *śīlasaṃvara* (ASBh 68,28) as "material restraint-consisting- in-discipline" (色戒律儀, ASVy$_c$ 730b15). ▪ Still, from a commonsensical point of view, the human meditator absorbed in one of the four immaterial concentrations *has* a body and thus the possibility to own an *avijñapti* (cf. AKBh 201,9: *tasya dhātvapatitatvāt*) very much in contrast to the one who is reborn in the immaterial realms. That would lead to the logical consequence that *dhyānasaṃvara* can only exist in the four *dhyāna* heavens and not with *dhyāna* practitioners on earth. ▪ BO DONG, in contrast, claims that the restraints of the immaterial realm are contained within the restraints of absorption (*gzugs med kyi sdom pa yang bsam gtan gyi sdom par 'dus ste*, AS-Bo-dong-bShad, p. 627,5). To support his thesis, he quotes the **Vyākhyā-saṃgrahaṇī* (*rnam par bshad pa'i sgo bsdu ba las*) saying that "those who act (=abide) in the material and immaterial [realms have?] the restraint of absorption" (*gzugs dang gzugs med pa na spyod pa bsam gtan gyi sdom pa dang zhes bzhed pa'i phyir ro*, AS-Bo-dong-bShad, p. 627,5). I have located an explanation in the Chinese e-text of the **Vyākhyā-saṃgrahaṇī*: a "differentiation according to the realms", saying that those in the realm of desire have the restraints of "individual liberation" (*prātimokṣa*), those in the material and immaterial (!) realms have the restraints of absorption, while the restraint without outflow does not belong to any realm (界差別者。謂欲行中有別解脫律儀。色無色行中有靜慮律儀。無漏律儀非界所繫, YBh$_c$ 757b28-c1, corresponding to YBh$_{t,P}$ 75b3f.). I am completely ignorant what could be the source for such a statement, but it certainly looks different from the Sarvāstivāda line of reasoning. According to DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 547, n. 213, referring to **Mahāvibhāṣā* 432b6ff.), the Vibhajyavādins allegedly "held that there was some form of matter in the *ārūpyas*". Even if that issue is not directly related to the question of *saṃvararūpa*, the Vibhajyavādin position would render the ASBh argument futile, i.e. that there are no *saṃvaras* for the higher absorptions because there is no matter in the realms of immateriality. ▪ Although I do not know where exactly the idea that "the restraints of the immaterial realm are contained within the restraints of absorption" comes from, it is well-known that the relation of the fourth *dhyāna* to the higher states was not always absolutely clear (see SCHMITHAUSEN, "Liberating Insight", pp. 204, 216f. and NYANATILOKA, *Buddhist Dictionary*, s.v. *jhāna*).

▪ If one were to apply not more than common sense, it is hard to see, if the restraint of absorption has any positive effect (warding off mental/emotional outbreaks of the defilements, see my note ad AS 57,22), why it should be *present* in the four *dhyāna*s, but *absent* in the four *samāpatti*s, be they meditative absorptions or divine realms. So it is systematically close at hand to deny either that *saṃvara*s are *rūpa*, or that there is no *rūpa* in the *samāpatti*s. Both solutions would go along quite well with common sense and without contradicting the sūtras. Remarkably, the AS does not mention *avijñaptirūpa* explicitly either in its definition of the *rūpaskandha*, nor does the term appear in either AS or ASBh in this discussion of *saṃvara* at all. AS 57,19-20 rather emphasizes that the *dhyānasaṃvara* is abandoning (*virati*), thereby showing a focus on the action, or even (because *virati* is physically rather a non-action) on the intention. ▪ Having addressed the issue of the body in the *samāpatti*s in this note, I would like to comment briefly upon the views put forth by Hartmut BUESCHER (*Vijñānavāda*, p. 48) on the role of the body during the *nirodhasamāpatti* (which is a state of meditation above the four worldly *samāpatti*s). As far as I see, the Buddhist scholars observed that the body of a meditator maintains its warmth and so on, while his mind is in a state similar to unconsciousness, in a meditative trance called *nirodha-samāpatti* (see NYANATILOKA, *Buddhist Dictionary*, s.v.). Now, trying to explain where the mind has gone during that period, the explanation that it somehow sticks with the body is close at hand. In fact, contemporary science claims that the mind is basically physical activity in the brain, and that there should be measurable activity inside the brain of even an unconscious person. Of course, scientific assertions do always go with the necessary agnostic reservations, i.e. that the results of empirical research are valid until there is evidence to the contrary. So, according to the preliminary results of empirical research, it seems that the mind actually is (or, *happens*) inside the body during unconsciousness. ▪ I do not understand BUESCHER's argument very well, but seems as if he claims that the early Yogācāras never held the mind to be located in the body during the *nirodhasamāpatti*. To that end, he seems to claim that the expression *rūpiṣv indriyeṣu* in the YBh (ad YBh MS 78b5, see SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 276, n. 146) does not mean "in the material faculties". *Rūpendriya* is often a code word for the body, the appropriated *rūpaskandha* (i.e. the first five of the eighteen *dhātu*s). BUESCHER tries to argue to the contrary, but he does not present his argument it in a way which I find convincing. ▪ At some point in Buddhist history, it became necessary to explain why a person with obviously intact eyeballs could be blind, a person with unimpaired ears deaf, and so on–an explanation no longer necessary at the present state of medical research. As an answer, it was assumed that the visible, palpable eye-ball, for example, was not the actual sense faculty, but that it was inhibited by a sense faculty consisting of a subtle matter, *rūpaprasāda*, which was invisible (on *rūpaprasāda*, see, e.g., SAKURABE, *Sonzai no bunseki*, pp. 94, 97, and SCHMITHAUSEN, "Sautrāntika-Voraussetzungen", p.117). Only by inference could one know of its presence, i.e. if one could see with the eyes, one could infer that the visual sense faculty was in operation. As far as I understand the AK, the faculties are not made of any of the four elements (earth, water, fire, wind) as such, but somehow based on the four, which justifies their appellation *upādayarūpa* (SWTF, s.v.: "die abhängige Form der Materie"), or the expression *mahābhūtāny upādāya* (at YBh 4,9). In contrast to the SWTF entry, BUESCHER (*op.cit.*, p. 67, n. 4), seems to argue that *upādayarūpa* is *not* matter due to its

being dependent (*upādāya*) on the four great elements (earth, water, fire, wind). For one, I may humbly suggest that the classical Abhidharma authors did not understand the exact implications of *upādāya* any clearer than we contemporary philologists do (see for example AKBh 462,19f.: *kim idam upādāyeti*). And against BUESCHER's reasoning, I see no source whatsoever which would claim that the sense faculties (which appropriate the palpable sense organs) are anything else than *rūpa* (see also COX, *Disputed Dharmas*, p. 241f.). Neither do I know of any source that denies that the four elements (earth, water, fire, wind) are *rūpa*. The sense faculties and the great elements thus share a quality which they do not share with the other four *skandha*s. The exact relation between the sense faculties and the great elements is anyhow contested and the passages brought forth by BUESCHER are univocally clear only in so far as the *rūpendriya* are *rūpa*. For example, the very sense-faculties (*dhātu*s 1-5) that are the base for the sense perceptions (*dhātu*s 13-17) are called *rūpātmakāḥ prasādāḥ* by Vasubandhu (AKBh 6,1), and I do not see that Yaśomitra (AKVy 24,9-14) denies that *rūpātmakāḥ* is an appropriate attribute for *prasādāḥ* (cf. BUESCHER, *op.cit.*, p. 68). In contrast, Yaśomitra explicitly states at AKVy 24,4 "because they are *rūpa* and also [at the same time] clarities, they are called 'clear *rūpa*' (or, 'material clarity', which would amount to the same)" (*rūpāṇi ca tāni prasādā ca ta iti rūpaprasāda*). Another example is AKVy 68,4, saying of *dhātu*s 1-5 and 7-11: "It means that those ten have atoms as their nature." (*paramāṇusvabhāvā daśaivety arthaḥ*). BUESCHER (*op.cit.*, p. 86) quotes that passage which should not leave any room for interpretation, but still he states that the sense-faculties are "bio-molecular [...] forces". Unfortunately he does not clarify the relation between the noun "forces" and its predicate "bio-molecular". I was surprised to see a skilled philologist as BUESCHER employing such a mode of expression. In Newtonian physics, forces never consist of molecules, even though forces are *physical* events, and I do not see any post-Newtonian terminology in BUESCHER's interpretations. Similarly, the verb *indanti* expresses the activity of the material sense faculties in the etymology *indantīti indriyāṇi*, "they are called faculties because they exert power" at AKBh 38,3, and esp. ASVy 93,8 (cf. BUESCHER, *op.cit.*, p. 71). ▪ What Yaśomitra does bring forth at AKVy 24,9-14 is an argument against the so-called "Vaibhāṣikas", who claim that the sense-faculties consist of "elements" (*bhūta*) in a "different form" (*vikāra*, the exact implications of which are as unclear to me as those of *upādāya*). He then presents an argument to the effect that the sense faculties cannot be perceived by the senses themselves, but only by inference. To my knowledge, no-one denies that fact which lies at the very core of the invention of "*rūpaprasāda*." Even where the sense faculties a taught to have a shape, they are still imperceptible to ordinary sense perception (see AKBh 33,14-21 ad AK I.44ab). That also the so-called "Sautrāntika" position of the in Tibetan debate manuals (see PERDUE, *Debate*, p. 218). And, whatever consists of an arrangement of atoms (*paramāṇu*, AKBh 195,8) in a certain shape (*saṃsthāna*, *ibid.*) does not have an established, proven (*siddha*, AKBh 195,10) nature (*svabhāva*, *ibid.*), in contrast to atoms like colour (*varṇa*, *ibid.*) and so on, the invisible "body faculty" atom or the atom (*paramāṇu*, AKBh 53,4) of any other faculty. As for the *shape*, just like a group of ants may be seen in a certain formation (AKBh 195,10), any shape is just constructed in one's apperceptive awareness (*saṃjñā*, AKBh 195,8). Or, in terms of debate-manual "Sautrāntika", an atom exists in an ultimate (*don dam*) sense, and any conglomerate just on the conventional level (*kun rdzob*). ▪ The question is thus what

Yaśomitra really wants to say with his argument against the alleged Vaibhāṣika position that *rūpaprasāda* is the "elements in a different form." Clearly, he wishes to assert less materiality to the sense faculties than the opponents he conjures. Still, the point of his argument is so difficult to identify that it also leads BUESCHER (*op.cit.*, p. 70) to conclude "As Yaśomitra seems to emphasize..." (my underline). Does Yaśomitra allude to the alleged Vaibhāṣika position that shape does somehow exist as a atom (AKBh 195,7)? At any rate, it is quite probable that Yaśomitra wrote his remarks later than, and with full knowledge of, the final redaction of the YBh, which includes both the "initial passage" and the *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra*. BUESCHER (*idib.*) proposes that Yaśomitra's remark reflects the position of "the Sautrāntikas[,] whose understanding [...] is [...] close to that of the Early Yogācāras". If the final version of the YBh reflects the views of the "Early Yogācāras", Yaśomitra was probably very close to them. ▪ What is at stake here is the question of pneuma, of the link between body and mind. That question is always a problem as long as one assumes that the mind can leave the body, as basically all religions claim, in contrast to FEUERBACH (*Gedanken über Tod und Unsterblichkeit*) and others. In my limited understanding, the assumption of *ālayavijñāna* staying in the same locus as the faculties comes close to the concept of a subtle astral body which leaves the body upon death and flies somewhere else, as in the drawing of ascending and descending souls near the centre of the Wheel of Life. It seems that the *ālayavijñāna* pervades the body endowed with sense faculties (P 5567, fol. 53b7: *dbang po dang bcas pa'i khog pa*), withdraws from it at death, and upon rebirth, a person may well be reborn deaf, blind, or with his *kāyendriya* impaired, due to the karmic imprints in the *ālayavijñāna*. But that does not mean that die *indriya*s produced in that way do not consist of a subtle, invisible (transparent?) form of matter, and that those are not more than a "force" (cf. BUESCHER, *op.cit.*, p. 86). As far as I see, that whole concept is not necessarily linked to idealism, which is an altogether different approach to solving the mind-matter problem. Still, the implication that *rūpa* is brought forth by *vijñāna* may presuppose or lead to idealist assumptions. ▪ In a materialist view, mind would be nothing more than a *function of* matter, and it seems that in the context of negating an *ātman* Abhidharma rationalism explained consciousness as not much more than the perception (*vijñāna*) which happens when an intact sense organ and an external object come into contact (which does not occur in the *nirodhasamāpatti* and similar states). Still, I know of no Buddhist source which would explicitly claim that the sense faculties consist of *rūpaprasāda* on the one hand, while they are nothing more than a *function of* otherwise inanimate matter on the other. Naturally, the Abhidharma aims of disproving an *ātman* (6 *vijñāna*s) and proving a spiritual continuum (7-8 *vijñāna*s) collide. ▪ For a later approach to the question of pneuma, I would like to refer the interested reader to tantric physiology as described in CHANG, *Six Yogas*, pp. 12-14, 56f., and 101-104. There, it is taught that *vijñāna* leaves the body at the collapse of the elements and the *prāṇa* system, a process during which the senses and the motor abilities fail. The 19th century Tibetan scholar RDZA DPAL SPRUL (*Kun bzang bla ma'i zhal lung*, p. 161) even claims that the muscles of a freshly slaughtered animal keep on shivering (*phril phril byed pa*) because the all-pervading wind (*khyab byed kyi rlung*) has not yet had time to escape (*'bros*) from the body, wherefore it is as if the animal was still alive (see also my notes on *prāṇātipāta*, AS 53,8-10, and *alpāyur*, ASBh 65,9). Similarly, according to CHANG (*Six Yogas*, p. 113), a

yogin practicing the transference of consciousness (*'pho ba*) is warned not to eject his *vijñāna* before his final breath. And, the ejection of consciousness is not necessary for those *yogin*s who have an advanced mastery in eliminating the dualism of subject and object (*ibid.*, pp. 45, 110-112), which includes understanding that the basis-of-everything is without birth (*ibid.*, p. 29, *kun gzhi skye med* in Tibetan, see also BUESCHER, *op.cit.*, p. 172). ▪ A couple of issues I cannot discuss in more detail for lack of time and expertise: a) The time-lag between *a.*) the invention of *ālayavijñāna* as bridging the *nirodhasamāpatti*, and *b.*) the invention of *ālayavijñāna* as carrying the seeds of *karman* which bring forth the body in a future rebirth (see BUESCHER, *Vijñānavāda*, p. 93). Just from a systematical angle it seems that material *avijñapti* being stored in the body was accepted for quite a long time in Yogācāra history (see NAKAMURA, *Bukkyōgo daijiten*, s.v. 無表思). That *could* have been one of the factors upholding the continuity between action and result during the *nirodhasamāpatti* as long as *ālayavijñāna* was not considered the storehouse for karmic seeds. b) The issue when and why *exactly* the concept of *rūpaprasāda* was invented. c) The discussion on whether or not the sense-faculties are produced by *karman* (on which see CHOONG, *Sūtrāṅga Portion*, p. 106f., and COX, *Disputed Dharmas*, p. 241f.). d) As for BUESCHER's claim that the embryo (*kalala*) does not possess the sense of touch (*op.cit.*, p. 88) the burden of proof is onto him, while the descriptions of suffering inside the womb certainly point into the opposite direction, i.e. a high sensitivity. e) As for the relation between the *kāyendriya* and the other four sense faculties (BUESCHER, *op.cit.*, p. 90), one can instantly verify that an intact eyeball is possessed of the sense of touch, if one wishes to do so. f.) I have to confess a certain personal aversion against BUESCHER's usage of the term "force." It reminds me of the term "energy" in contemporary new-age writings, which is certainly not fair. "Force" is used in physics to describe things like gravity or magnetism which are physical, somehow related to matter, but probably not matter themselves. Furthermore, as a matter of fact, the word used for sense faculies, *indriya*, means "force" (but cf. Tib. *dbang po* and not *dbang*) and Vasubandhu also uses the term *śakti* in the AKBh partly in a very vague sense (another example of his terminological vagueness is *pariṇāmaviśeṣa*). Still, I hope to have shown that the expression *rūpiṣv indriyeṣu* does at least implicitly mean "in the body." • I have pointed to the fact that the AS often avoids controversial issues. That might be different in this case of matter in the immaterial realm: The Vibhajyavādins allegedly held that there was some kind of *rūpa* even in the immaterial realm (see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 547f., n. 213). According to DELEANU, the source for that position of the so-called Vibhajyavādins is the **Mahāvibhāṣa*, which may not render the Vibhajyavāda position correctly (see also my reservations about traditional school designation in the introduction). They might have raised an objection similar to my own commonsensical one, i.e. that the human *yogin* in *ārūpya* meditation still *has* a body to accommodate all kinds of *saṃvara*s. ▪ The respective explanations in the *Śrāvakabhūmi* (see DELEANU, *op.cit.*, pp. 336f. and 458) do not address that issue. I may be missing something important here, but it seems to me that that section of the *Śrāvakabhūmi* deals with the mental events during *dhyāna* meditation, and not with the divine *dhyāna* heavens. • At AKBh 73,26, Vasubandhu claims that *vijñāna* has *karman* as its support (*karmādhāra*) in the immaterial realm, and not the life-faculty (*jīvitendriya*) as the Sarvāstivādins assert.

Vasubandhu accepts their position that *vijñāna* needs something to "support" it during a life in the *ārūpya* heaven, at least for the sake of argument. But if *vijñāna* needs to be supported, the Sarvāstivādins obviously do not believe that *karman* alone has the power to do so, and far as I see, Vasubandhu adduces no compelling argument to convince them of the opposite. Especially if *karman* here simply means the secondary mental factor *cetanā* (as BUESCHER, *Vijñānavāda*, p. 57, n. 3 understands it, and as it is normally classified in the *dharma* scheme), I do not see how it would "support" the *vijñāna* *concretely*. The *vijñāna* is certainly not carried through the immaterial realm by willpower. Vasubandhu obviously tries to propagate that *not* the *jīvitendriya* but *karman* determines the length of life, but his argument is rather futile for there is no contradiction between the two (see KRITZER, *Vasubandhu*, p. 68f., and my notes ad ASBh 65,9, *alpāyur*). Saying that *karman* determines the length of life does not *disprove* the *jīvitendriya* as a *dharma*–one may still believe in it or not. In fact, Vasubandhu explicitly disclaims that he wants to disprove the *jīvitendriya* as a whole. He rather likens the process to grains (*sasya*) growing at a certain time or to an arrow that, once shot (*kṣpitêṣu*), flies a certain distance–that is how *karman* sets the length of life (AKBh 74,5). Saṅghabhadra, of course, remains rather unimpressed by this argument (see COX, *Disputed Dharmas*, p. 293f.). Coming back to BUESCHER's views discussed above, neither Vasubandhu nor Saṅghabhadra claim that the *jīvitendriya* is *rūpa* (see also AKBh-Index-Skt, p. XIV), and they surely agree that a *rūpendriya* cannot exist in the immaterial realm.

291 The implications of this statement are not clear to me. As far as I know, it is the role of the *prātimokṣa* restraints to suppress physical and verbal outbreaks that follow acute outbreaks of the defilements. The role of the *dhyānasaṃvara* is to ward off only mental/emotional outbreaks.

292 The VinSg is, again, more explicit about the "complete eradication" of those latencies ("seeds", **bīja*) by the adept when he attains a direct insight into the Four Noble truths. Although it is not stated explicitly here, this is the Path of Seeing (*darśanamārga*) by which one reaches one of the fruits of an Ārya. Having seen the Four Truths directly, doubt is completely eradiced, and so are other latent defilements that could potentially give rise to unwholesome behaviour: "If he, based on the faultless restraints of discipline as well as on the restraints of absorption, directly realizes (*mngon par rtogs*, **abhi-sam-/i*) the [Four] Truths, and achieves the fruit of a Non-Returner (i.e. the third fruit of an Ārya), too, then, at that time, the seeds of corrupt discipline are completely eradicated (*yang dag par bcoms pa*, **samudghāta*). If [otherwise], based on the *anāgamya*, he achieves the first fruit [of an Ārya], then, at that time, the seeds of corrupt discipline that [could] cause him to go into a bad destiny (**durgati*) are completely eradicated. That is the discipline which the Āryas delight in, and it has to be understood that his restraints are [then] pure through that second [kind of] purity–and exactly that is what one calls 'his restraint without outflow'. (*gal te tshul khrims kyi sdom pa skyon med pa de nyid dang bsam gtan gyi sdom pa de la yang brten nas bden pa rnams mngon par rtogs par byed cing / phyir mi 'ong ba'i* (D: *'ong ba'i*; P: *'ongs pa'i*) *'bras bu yang 'thob* (P: *'thob*; D: *thob*) *par byed pa de'i tshe na ni de'i tshul khrims 'chal ba'i sa bon thams cad yang dag par bcom pa yin no // gal te mi lcogs pa med pa la brten nas 'bras bu dang*

po thob par byed pa de'i tshe na ni de'i ngan song du 'gro bar 'gyur ba'i tshul khrims 'chal pa'i sa bon yang dag par bcom pa yin no // de dag ni de'i 'phags pa dgyes pa'i tshul khrims yin te / yongs su dag pa gnyis pa 'dis de'i sdom pa rnam par dag pa yin par rig par bya ste / de nyid de'i zag pa med pa'i sdom pa zhes bya'o //, $VinSg_{t,P}$ *zi* 33b4-7, $Vin_{t,D}$ *zhi* 31a2-4, corresponds to YBh_c 590b29-590c6). The *anāgamya* mentioned here is one of the possible states of meditation, a preliminary stage of a meditative concentration before the first *dhyāna*. It usage here indicates that the adept reaches the Path of Seeing without practicing four levels of absorption. The Path of Seeing, eradicating all doubts about the Four Noble Truths through a direct vision, can be reached, for example, by practicing with a focus on insight (*prajñā*), skipping the *dhyāna*s at least temporarily. On *anāgamya*, see SCHMITHAUSEN, "Liberating Insight", p. 240f. and DELHEY, *Samāhitā Bhūmiḥ*, p. 36f., n. 97. This touches upon soteriological issues quite beyond the scope of this study (see also DELHEY, *op.cit.*, p. 41, n. 111, on AS 68,3, and SCHMITHAUSEN, "Spiritual Practice in Early Yogācāra", p. 220, n. 20). • See also the definition of *anāsravasaṃvara* at AKBh 205,17: *anāsravasaṃvaro 'nāsravaṃ śīlam*.

293 The translation 已見諦者 ("the one who has already seen the Truths", cf. YBh-Index-CST, s.v.) seems more explicit than 以見諦者 ("by the one who sees the Truths").

294 The Tibetan word for *virati*, *spangs pa*, is in the past tense here, in contrast to the above phrases (ad AS 57,19-21) where it is in the present tense (*spong ba*). I am unaware of any rule in which tense Sanskrit verbal nouns ending in *-ti* should be rendered in Tibetan, so I assume the Tibetan translators put more emphasis on the *process* when translating *spong ba*, and more on its *result* when translating *spangs pa*. For a similar problem in the VinSg, see AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, pp. 125, n. 606. and p. 305, n. 512.

295 Parallels: YBh 191,8-11: *dvādaśāsaṃvarikanikāyāḥ / tadyathā / aurabhrikāḥ kaukkuṭikāḥ saukarikāḥ śvaśākuntikāḥ śaśavāgurikāś caurā bandhanapālakāḥ sūcakāḥ kāraṇākārāpakā nāgamaṇḍalikāś ca*. **Mahāvibhāṣā* 607a25-28: 有十二種不律儀家, etc.; AKBh 221,11-15: *tatreme āsaṃvarikās tadyathā aurabhrikāḥ kaukkuṭikāḥ* (PRADHAN, n. 13: Y seems to be *kaurkuṭikāḥ*) *śaukarikāḥ śākunikā* (PRADHAN, n. 14: *śākunikāḥ*) *mātsikā mṛgalumdhakāḥ vāgurikāś caurā vadhyaghātakā bandhanapālakā nāgabandhakāḥ* (PRADHAN, n. 15: Y.D. *nāgabandhāḥ*) *śvapākā vāgurikāś ca / rājāno daṇḍanetāro vyavahāhikaś cārtha* (PRADHAN, n. 16: D *nīticālitā* in place of *arthaḥ*) *āsaṃvarikāḥ* (PRADHAN, n. 17: D āsāṃvarikāḥ). Acc. to LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (*Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, p. 92, n. 1), that list corresponds to AN I, p. 251, II, p. 207, III, p. 303, III, p. 383. Moreover, the professions mentioned here are mostly contained in a list at MaVyu 3670-3855. See also RAHULA, *Compendium*, p. 92, ns. 1, 2. • AN III, p. 383 reads: *orabbhikā sūkarikā sākuṇikā māgavikā luddā macchaghātakā corā coraghātakā bandhanāgārikā*. • On the ethical implications of the *asaṃvara* lists, see also SCHMITHAUSEN, "Ethics of Nature", p. 53.

296 The expression 控牛 ("one who drags/holds a cow") at AS_c 680b10 (魁膾控牛縛象) has no equivalent in AS_t or in the ASBh explanations (and in the latter's rendering in

ASVy$_{tc}$). The reading 害牛 ("one who harms/slays cows") appears in many versions. See AS$_c$ (中華 ed.) 641b18, and ASVy$_c$ 730b10.

[297] According to BÖHTLINGK and ROTH, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, *aurabhrika* (s.v.) means "shepherd" ("Schafhirt"), a word that seems to be related to *aurabhraka* (s.v.), "a flock of sheep" (the latter term is found in grammatical and lexicographical literature only). The AS translations nonetheless propose "butcher, killer" (*bshan pa*, AS$_t$, dto. MaVyu 3758) or "sheep butcher" (屠羊, AS$_c$). The Tibetan term "butcher, killer" is certainly far too unspecific, especially if one interprets *kaukkuṭika* as someone who butchers poultry (*bya gag bsod pa*, AS$_t$, cf. MaVyu 3763: *bya gag tshong ba*, "someone who sells poultry"). Note that even the Tibetan AS translators understood *śaukarika* as "someone who makes his living through pigs" (*phag gis 'tsho ba*; cf. MaVyu 3763: *phag tshong ba*, "someone who sells pigs/swine"). The Chinese reads "someone who raises poultry" (養鷄) for *kaukkuṭika* and "someone who raises boars" (養猪) for *śaukarika*. The ASBh commentary only states that the *aurabhrika* makes his living by selling livestock (*paśu*) after having killed it. That need not necessarily be an explanation of what an *aurabhrika*'s work mainly consists in, but rather *why* it is unwholesome. My assumption is that breeding and slaughtering animals were not always separate professions in Indian society. See also my notes on the term *ghoṣa*, below.

[298] For Skt. *sūcakāḥ*, MaVyu 3740 proposes the equivalents *log po pa*, *'dam po pa*, *log po*, *'dam po*; MaVyu 5587: *gzung gzer*, *gzungs gzer*. The Tibetan word used in the AS$_t$ and ASBh$_t$, *nyan rna* (lit. "listening ear") in the sense of "spy", usually stands for Skt. *heri* and *cara* (MaVyu 3805, 3806). AS$_c$, ASVy$_c$: "slanderer" (讒搆).

[299] The corresponding explanation at AKBh 205,13 is extremely brief: "Restraint and non-restraint, and, what is different from those two: what is neither restraint nor non-restraint (*saṃvaraś cāsaṃvaraś ca / tābhyāṃ cetaro naiva saṃvaro nāsaṃvaraḥ*)."

[300] The short list provided by XUANZANG is strikingly absent in the ASVy$_t$, too. It seems that the ASVy author did not consider it necessary to supply this list. • On three kinds of *karman* from the point of view of resulting sensation, see also AKBh 228,3ff.; **Mahāvibhāṣā* 596b12ff., SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna*, p. 433, n. 887.

[301] According to RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 92, n. 3), the fourth absorption (*dhyāna*) of the material realm (*rūpadhātu*) and the four attainments of the immaterial realm (*ārūpyadhātu*) are not included because there are no pleasant or unpleasant sensations there. See also below, AS 58,13. • I follow AS$_t$ "the realm of desire and the three *dhyāna*s". XUANZANG translates "from the realm of desire up to the third *dhyāna*" (從欲界乃至第三靜慮).

[302] Parallel: YBh 192,7-9: *adukhāsukhavedanīyaṃ karma yat sarvatrālayavijñānavaipākyaṃ karma caturthāc ca dhyānād ūrdhvam āniñjyam*. See also MUROJI ("Āniñjya-karma", p. 131f.), and SCHMITHAUSEN, "Weiteres Fragment aus dem Prakaraṇa", pp. 78-80.

[303] The *Cūḷakammavibhaṅgasutta* (MN, no. 135) rather loosely speaks of *kamma* which

ripens in this lifetime, or in a another or thereafter. This is probably a precursor of the more technical threefold classification. See HALBFASS, *Karma und Wiedergeburt,* p. 98. • A cursory look at later introductory works such as SGAM PO PA's *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, or the *Manual of Abhidhamma* (NĀRADA MAHĀ THERA) does not lead to extensive explanations of those categories, such as the AS, AKBh or YBh provide (see below). One could indeed argue that, once the order of ripening in general has been explained, the exact definition of, e.g., *karman* to be experienced in the next life is of lesser practical value. TSONG KHA PA (*Lam rim che ba*, p. 188, see also id., *Stages of the Path*, p. 242f.) quotes a passage from the YBh which is much less technical than the explanations in the AS and AKBh, with no mention of *maitrīsamāpatti* or the various kinds of spiritual attainments.

304 See YBh 191,9f., YBh 186,10 and AKBh 232,5 (*atha dṛṣṭadharmavedanīyaṃ karma kīdṛśaṃ veditavyam /)*. • According to RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 92, n. 5), someone who gives alms to a monk, or to someone who quits some kind of meditative attainment (*samāpatti*) will receive the results for that act in that very life. • Karman to be experienced in this lifetime is also explained at YBh 186,11-14,17-19, $\text{VinSt}_{t,D}$ 144a6ff.

305 DELHEY, *Samāhitā Bhūmiḥ*, p. 31, translates *samādhi* as "Versenkung".

306 Cf. AKBh 232,22: *maitrīvyutthita.*

307 Cf. AKBh 232,23: *darśanamārgavyutthita.*

308 According to $\text{VinSg}_{t,P}$ *zi* 152a4-6, an Arhat will experience the karmic results of unwholesome deeds in this lifetime only. If their ripening was certain (*niyatavipāka*), even a little amount of suffering in this final lifetime counts as a sufficient. See SAKUMA, *Āśrayaparivṛtti*, vol. 2, p. 171-173.

309 $\text{AS}_{t,P}$ *shin tu* has obviously been corrected from *shin du* on the printing block.

310 MaVyu 1125: *araṇasamādhi* (*nyon mongs pa med pa'i ting nye 'dzin*). See also BHSD (s.v. *araṇa*). • Cf. YBh 186,11-12: (to be read) *evam araṇāyā nirodha°*, or AKBh 232,21: *araṇāvyutthita.*

311 AKBh 232,20: *nirodhasamāpattivyutthita.*

312 Cf. YBh 186,12: *arhatvaphalāc ca vyutthitaṃ*; AKBh 232,24: *arhatphalavyutthita.*

313 Cf. YBh 185,18f. The *pañcānantarīyāṇi* are also listed in MaVyu 2323-2328. RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 93, n. 1) refers to AN III, p. 146.

314 Similar discussion in AKBh 230,2 ff.: *janmāntare 'py asti dṛṣṭadharmavedanīyasya karmaṇo vipāka ārambhavaśāt tan nāma vyavasthānam ity apare / ... .*

315 AKBh 230,2: *aparaparyāyavedanīyaṃ tasmāt pareṇa /*. See also YBh 192,10-12: ... *tadūrdhvaṃ* (instead of *tasmāt pareṇa*).

316 Cf. YBh 193,1-5, AKBh 235,1-5. PĀSĀDIKA (*Kanonische Zitate*, p. 83) has identified MĀ 600a26-28 (in sūtra no. 111, the 達梵行經) as the source and gives many parallels. In the Pāli Canon: AN II, p. 230 (*cattār' imāni bhikkhave kammāni ...*). See also SKILLING,

Four Kinds of Karma. • The abhidharma explanations on these four kinds of *karman* vary greatly. See FUKUHARA, *Gōhon, zuiminbon*, p. 83, and LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Abhidharmakośa*, ch. 4, pp. 128-133. More references are contained in the *Foguang dacidian* (s.v. 四業). The explanations in NAKAMURA, et al. (*Iwanami bukkyōjiten*, s.v. 黒白) match those of the AS. NAKAMURA, et al. refer to MĀ, no. 111 as the source (same as PĀSĀDIKA, *Kanonische Zitate*, p. 83). That sūtra mentions the four items but does not explain them. • Commenting upon this AS passage, DPANG LO distinguishes between *karman* with and without inflow. The three *karmas* with inflow (*gzag bcas kyi las gsum*) are the first three kinds (black, white, black-and-white). AS-dPang-lo, fol. 245a6. Now, if anything is free from inflow, it must, according to Abhidharma systematics, belong to either the Truth of the Path or the Truth of Cessation. DPANG LO thus implicitly accepts the doctrine that there is a kind of liberating *karman*. This special case of *karman* doctrine has been pointed out by SCHMITHAUSEN ("Critical Response", p. 207). • This whole AS passage is quoted in the *mChims mdzod.* See MCHIMS 'JAM PA'I DBYANGS, *mNgon pa'i rgyan*, fol. 219b.

317 This explanation is in accordance with AKBh 235,6 (*aśubhaṃ karma ekāntena kṛṣṇaṃ kliṣṭatvāt kṛṣṇavipākaṃ cāmanojñavipākatvāt /*). Other views are discussed at AKBh 236,14ff. • Instead of *akuśalam*, YBh 193,1 reads *apuṇyaṃ* which is systematically not different.

318 DPANG LO's rephrasing of this sentence is ambivalent as Tibetan prose. It should most probably be translated as: "That which is black because it is defiled as well as black because it has unwanted ripening is unwholesome" (*nyon mongs pa can yin pas gnag la rnam smin mi 'dod pa can yin pas gnag pa ni mi dge ba'o //*, AS-dPang-lo, fol. 245a6). The argumentation of the ASBh, however, is that this kind of *karman* is called "having black ripening" because its ripening is unwanted. • According to RAHULA's translation (*Compendium*, p. 93), black and white karma that leads to black and white results is the action that belongs to the realm of desire (*kāmadhātu*), because it is black in its disposition (*āśaya*), but white in its preparation (*prayoga*).

319 Having explained black *karman* with black ripening (see above), DPANG LO's states: "The opposite of that is wholesome [*karman*] with inflows" (*de las bzlog pa ni dge ba zag bcas so //*, AS-dPang-lo, fol. 245a6). It takes quite a rigid view of logic A reader who is not informed about the doctrines of the AS would not necessarily understand that "the opposite of that" (*de las bzlog pa*) refers to white *karman* with white ripening.

320 $ASVy_{t,P}$ 246b5 adds: 'that which is not defiled' (*gang nyon mongs pa can ma yin pa'o //*, dto. $ASVy_{t,D}$ 206b4), while $ASVy_c$ 731a10 reads: "because it is not defiled, and because [it has] a desired ripening" (不染污故。可愛異熟故). • Systematically "wholesome [*karman*] of the three realms" is identical to *karman* with inflow (*sāsrava*). • This explanation of the AS differs from YBh 193,2, where only the immovable *karman* is considered white with white ripening. • According to AKBh 235,6, only the meritorious (= wholesome) *karman* of the material realm is white with white ripening (*rūpāptaṃ śubham ekāntena śuklam akuśalenāvyatibhedāt /*). The meritorious *karman* of the realm of immateriality (*ārūpyāptam*) is discussed separately at AKBh 235,7-9. $ASVy_{t,P}$ 248b5

reads *gang nyon mongs pa can ma yin yin pa'o*. Grammatically, *ma yin yin pa* ("what is that which is not...") is quite odd. The repetition of *yin* may simply be a misprint.

[321] For a definition of *kāmapratisaṃyukta*, see YBh 192,12f., AS 24,19f. • My translation "connected with [the realm of] desire" is supported by AS_c (欲界繫), MaVyu 2147-2149, and AS-dPang-lo, fol. 245a6-b1 (disregarding the fact that *kāma* in this context may rather refer to "sensual pleasures"). • The theories of YBh 193,3 and AKBh 235,9-10 differ from the AS. There, *puṇya* (i.e. the wholesome *karman* of the realm of desire) is black and white with black and white ripening.

[322] • DPANG LO's commentary is again basically a rephrasing of ASBh: "Mixed [*karman*] of the realm of desire is what is black because of its disposition (*bsam pa*) and white because of its preparation [...]" (*'dod khams kyi 'dren ma ni bsam pas nag la sbyor bas dkar ba* [...], AS-dPang-lo, fol. 245a6-b1), and so on. • $ASVy_c$ 731a11-15 reads: "How is one *karman* wholesome as well as unwholesome? In this [context] it is not that, with reference to the moments of arising that it is stated that one kind of *karman* is wholesome as well as unwholesome. Rather, referring to disposition and preparation [taking them] together, the explained as one *karman*. That is the intent of this sūtra. Because, with reference to these two kinds, i.e. black and white, which are dissimilar, one establishes one kind [of *karman*]: black and white *karman*" (云何一業亦善不善。此中不約生剎那相說一種業亦善不善。然約意樂($ASVy_j$, p. 165 reads 意業, which is a merely a misprint)及方便總說一業。是此經意。約此二種若黑若白互不相似。建立一種黑白業故). • DPANG LO: "[One] does not postulate one moment of intention that induces an action as [consisting of] the two opposed black and white [kinds of *karman*]" ([...] *las 'jug byed sems pa'i skad cig gcig dkar nag 'gal ba gnyis su mi 'jog go*, AS-dPang-lo, fol. 245b2) • $ASBh_t$ mistranslates *anyonyāsādṛśye* omitting the negation (*phan tshun 'dra ba*).

[323] Concluding his commentary on the three kinds of *karman* with inflow, DPANG LO quotes AK IV.63acd (see AKBh 236), lines which refer to other opinions (i.e. different from the AK), none of which matches the AS. As also the opinion alluded to in AK IV.63b differs from the AS, it remains unclear why DPANG LO left out that line. Without any further discussion, he closes the quotation with "[Others] also say so" (*ces kyang smra'o //*, AS-dPang-lo, fol. 245b2-3). It seems that DPANG LO presupposed a solid knowledge of the AK, for his quotation–which also lacks any indication of the source–is of little value otherwise. On the other hand, *gzhan ni* (of AK VI.63a, *gzhan ni dmyal ba myong 'gyur dang //*) is glossed in smaller type as *slob dpon*, a gloss which is redundant for those conversant with the AK instructions, which could indicate that the glosses in smaller type were not made by dPang lo but by a later editor.

[324] The verb *paruṣayati* can be found at ŚrBh 49,8 (SHUKLA's edition).

[325] YBh parallel: *akṛṣṇaśuklam avipākaṃ karma karmakṣayāya saṃvartate* (YBh 193,4).

[326] I follow the interpretation of ASBh 70,9, according to which *kṛṣṇa* is to be negated here, but not *śukla*. This ASBh explanation differs fundamentally from the most common explanations, which favour an interpretation as "not black, not white" (*akṛṣṇam aśuklam*,

AKBh 235,2; *akaṇham asukkam*, MN I, p. 391).

[327] Definition of *prayogamārga* at AS 70,10 (Skt. preserved): *prayogamārgaḥ katamaḥ / yena kleśaṃ prajāhati //.* • Definition of *ānantaryamārga* at AS 70,10-11 (Skt. preserved): *ānantaryamārgaḥ katamaḥ / yasyānantaraṃ nirantaḥ kleśaḥ prahīṇo bhavati //.*

[328] The phrase *karmakṣayāya saṃvartate* (reconstructed according to ASBh) is somewhat odd. I would expect a straight nominal construction before *katamat*. The Tibetan (*las zad par 'gyur ba'i*) and Chinese (能盡諸業) translations of both AS and ASVy do not render *karmakṣayāya saṃvartate* literally.

[329] ASVy$_t$ here differs strongly from the ASBh text: "[That kind of *karman* is] 'conducive to the extinction of *karman*' because it transforms [the basis?] rightly. Here, the three kinds [of *karman*], such as 'not black and white...' and so on are the *karman* without inflow. Therefore, [*karman*] without inflow is without taking [any] ripening. [And] therefore, it overcomes [*karman* with inflow] completely." (*las zad par 'gyur ba ni yang dag par bsgyur ba'i phyir ro // 'dir mi gnag cing dkar ba la sogs pa rnam pa gsum ni zag pa med pa'i las so // de bas na zag pa med pa ni rnam par smin pa len pa med pa'i phyir kun du bcom pa'o //*, ASVy$_{t,P}$ 249a5-6, ASVy$_{t,D}$ 207a2-3). ASVy$_c$ accords with the ASBh, not with ASVy$_t$: "'Extinguishes all *karman*': Because, through the power of *karman* without inflow, the imprints that bring about (與) ripening of the three [kinds of] *karman* with inflow are removed" (能盡諸業者。由無漏業力永拔黑等三有漏業與異熟習氣故, ASVy$_c$ 731a24-26). • Note that the Arhat may still experience the results of previous unwholesome *karman* in his final lifetime (see my notes ad AS 58,18-21).

[330] This sentence is clearly an addition by XUANZANG and not original AS text that is somehow missing in the AS$_t$. The ASBh here comments upon a list of terms that are not mentioned in the AS, and I take that unusual proceeding as an indication that the subject matter (annihilation of *karman*) was controversial. I assume the ASBh author found it necessary to provide further arguments. The ASVy author added "therefore" (ASVy$_{t,P}$ 249a6: *de'i phyir*; ASVy$_c$ 731a27: 復次), as if the list would logically follow from the preceding ASBh explanations. • Another proof for this sentence not to be AS text is that it is not mentioned in RGYAL TSHAB RJE's commentary. See AS-rGyal-tshab, p. 764,5.

[331] The ASBh here exceptionally adds a list of key terms followed by explanation on those terms. It looks like the author of the ASBh found basic explanations of the AS incomplete. XUANZANG, who included the whole sentence (ASBh 70,12-14) in AS$_c$, obviously shared that opinion, followed by PRADHAN, RAHULA and TATIA (the latter marks this sentence as belonging to the root text).

[332] The word *mauneya* means "the properties (/ habits) constitutive of a sage". Cf. BHSD (s.v.) "the state of being a Muni". • The translators of ASBh$_t$ chose to translate *mauneya* (for which the standard equivalent is, according to MaVyu 9365 *mi smra ba*, "not speaking") in the sense of *muni* ("sage", Tib. *thub pa*).

[333] The following chart may serve as an outline of this complicated sentence:

Explanation of All *karmas* Without Inflow		
adversary	conformity	nature
crookedness, fault, degeneration	purities	[the *karman*] of the Munis

• On the whole issue of silence and purity, cf. AKBh 236,22-237,11, which concludes: "And those instructions [were made] for the purpose of sorting out those who have confidence in wrong silence and wrong purity." (*eṣā ca deśanā mithyāmauna* ‹according to PRADHAN, the AKBh MS reads °*maunaṃ* for °*mauna*› *śaucādhimuktikānāṃ vivecanārtham* /, AKBh 237,11).

334 Cf. YBh 193,5: *vaṃkakarma yad itobāhyānāṃ tīrthyānāṃ kuśalākuśalaṃ.*

335 Cf. YBh 193,7-9: *doṣakarma yad ihadhārmikāṇāṃ pṛthagjanānāṃ śāsane viparīta-darśināṃ svayaṃdṛṣṭiparāmarśasthāyināṃ mithyāniścitānāṃ yat kuśalākuśalaṃ karma.*

336 Cf. YBh 193,9-11: *kaṣāyakarma yat tāvad vaṃkakarma doṣakarma kaṣāyakarmāpi tat / api khalu kaṣāyakarma yad ihadhārmikāṇāṃ pṛtagjanānāṃ śāsane 'niścitānām sandigdhabuddhīnāṃ yat kuśalākuśalaṃ karma.*

337 The metaphor of defilement and purity is mainly carried by the terms *kaṣayāḥ* (sediments), *kāluṣya* (turbidity, opacity) as opposite to *prasāda* (faith, but also purity, clarity). The term *tīrthika* literally refers to people who frequent the places for ritual bathing (*tīrtha*).

338 Cf. YBh 193,11-13: *śucikarma yad ihadhārmikāṇāṃ pṛthagjanānāṃ śāsane samyagniścitānām sandigdhabuddhīnāṃ kuśalaṃ karma.*

339 On the term *paryāya* ("synonym, alternative explanation") in the context of doctrinal exposition, see NAGAO, *Mādhyamika and Yogācāra*, p. 132, and also DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 565f., n. 256. AHN (*Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 36): "synonyme Bezeichnungen".

340 On the term *satkāyadṛṣṭi*, see AHN (*Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 163f., n. 18.), who chose to leave it untranslated. KRAMER (*Fünf*-vastu-*Abschnitt*, p. 139, n. 193) translates "falscher Glaube an ein Ich". See also *ibid.*, p. 170f. on *satkāya* ("Dasein") in the YBh. I for my part would prefer to avoid "Dasein" as an equivalent, fearing it might be understood in an Heideggerian sense. ERB, *Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti*, p. 42 translates *satkāyadṛṣṭi* as "falsche Ansicht [der Existenz eines beharrlichen Selbstes in den] Persönlichkeitskonstituenten" and explains this on p. 134, n. 313 (see also p. 141, n. 380). Although our understanding of the term *satkāya* has thus increased, it still belongs to those Buddhist technical terms etymology of which is not clear, as has already been stated by CONZE (*Buddhist Thought in India*, p. 172). CONZE (*ibid.*) translates *satkāyadṛṣṭi* as "view of individuality", or (*idid.*, p. 38) "false view of individuality". At firt sight the term appears to mean "the view holding the body (!) to be real (/good)", but *kāya* may refer here to the psycho-physical *conglomerate* as a whole (similar to the more metaphorical use of English "body"), as implied by Erb.

341 Cf. YBh 193,13-14: *munikarma yad ihadhārmikāṇām apṛthagjanānām āryāṇāṃ*

sāikṣāśaikṣaṃ kuśalaṃ karma.

[342] Non-trainees are those who have attained the fruit of Arhatship while trainees dwell on any of the three fruits below that level (DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 475, n. 25). The definition of "trainees" at AS 91,16-17 (PRADHAN's retranslation, slightly improved) should read: *kāmāvacāraḥ śaikṣaḥ katamaḥ / yaḥ kāmadhātāv upapanna āryadharmāṇāṃ labhī sūvaśeṣasaṃyojanaḥ pudgalaḥ.*

[343] For the corresponding section on giving in the AKBh, see AKBh 268,8-270,12. See also YBh 191,14f.: *nidānataḥ samutthānataḥ svabhāvato 'dhiṣṭhānataś ca veditavyaṃ.*

[344] AS$_c$, addition by XUANZANG: "Again, there are many [kinds of] pure *karman*, like giving and so on" (復有施等諸清淨業).

[345] On the term *samutthāna*, AHN (*Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 187, n. 82) explains: "Samutthāna kann intransitiv oder transitiv sein (AiGr II.2., 183+185. Tib. *kun nas slong ba* und Chin. 起 sprechen für eine transitive Auffassung; in VinSg 58/59 (P 129a3; Chin. 627a5; s. Kap. IV B.1) ist das Wort ebenfalls transitiv, hier Chin. 能起." See also the causative *samutthāpaka* (Tib. *kun nas slong ba*, Chin. 發起) above (AS 57,19-20). In the Tibetan version of the VinSg, the causative *samutthāpayati* is translated as *kun nas slong ba*. See AHN, *op.cit.*, p. 72f.

[346] Cf. YBh 191,16f.: *cetanā alobhādveṣāmohasahagatā.*

[347] Cf. YBh 191,18: *adhiṣṭhānato deyaṃ vastu.*

[348] Cf. YBh 191,16: *deyavastuparityāgāya kāyavākkarma°.*

[349] It seems of course quite inconsistent that mental action should not be considered the nature of giving, after intention has been propagated as action at AS 53,3-4. Subsequently, the reading of AS$_c$ and ASVy$_c$ (身語意業) seems to be an attempt to correct the AS to that effect. Still, the reading of AS$_t$ and ASVy$_t$ (*lus kyi las dang ngag gi las so*) excluding mental action is more convincing in this context, as mental action has been classified as the "motivation" of giving at AS 59,15.

[350] To my knowledge, impartial giving to all ascetics was the common practice in India at the time the Vinaya was installed. It should be noted here that this practice was still advocated at the time the AS was composed, either motivated by a fundamental spirit of tolerance and non-sectarianism, or out of more strategic concerns. Or, most likely, a mixture of the two.

[351] Cf. YBh$_c$ 762a9-10: 一切總有六施。一無所依施。二廣大施。三歡喜施。四數數施。五田器施。六攝受眷屬施. YBh$_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a3 (=YBh$_{t,P}$ *'i* 26b5f.). The terms are explained one by one at YBh$_c$ 762a2-8. Note that no. 6 (攝受眷屬施) differs from AS$_c$ (善分布新舊施). I similar term is nonetheless mentioned at YBh$_c$ 710b12f. (善分布). • Also the corresponding list at *Bodhisattvabhūmi* 92,11f. mentions only the first five of those terms. Nos. 4, 3, and 1 are also mentioned at *Bodhisattvabhūmi* 209,2.

[352] See also CPD (s.v. *anisrita*), b) "free from worldliness". • According to BHSD,

aniśrita (s.v.) means "unattached", "free", "emancipated". That indicates a supramundane character of giving. I see this confirmed by the ASBh explanations, which a.) contain "abandoning freely" (*muktatyāga*) as a synonym for *aniśritadāna*, and b.) state that unattached giving does not aim at worldly goals, such as (a good) rebirth in *saṃsāra*.

[353] On the meaning of *viśada* in this context (i.e. *dāna*), see BHSD (s.v. *viśada*) and the respective passages in *Bodhisattvabhūmi* 85,11f., 3,5f. In non-Buddhist usage *viśada* means "pure, clear" (see below). • PRADHAN retranslates the Chinese term 廣清淨施故 as *mahāśucidanatas*. Based on that, RAHULA translates "pureté totale" and remarks (*Compendium*, p. 95, n. 2) that "purity" is recommended on the sides of both the giver (*dāyaka*) as well as the receiver (*pratigrāhaka*). Purity is only achieved when both sides are pure (RAHULA refers to MN III, p. 256). This, of course, encourages donations to the monastic order rather than to anybody else. • Note, anyhow, that the Mahāyāna concept of *trimaṇḍala-pariśuddhi* finds no mention in the AS or ASBh. It is considered quintessential for the Perfection of Giving in the *Prajñāpāramitāsūtra*s. See, e.g. HIRAKAWA, *Indian Buddhism*, p. 300, CONZE, *Buddhist Thought in India*, p. 215, and LAMOTTE, *Vertu de sagesse*, vol. 2, p. 724.

[354] MN, no. 142 (same as mentioned by RAHULA above) declares the donation that is given with joy to be superior to that given with regret (MN III, p. 257). • Cf. *Bodhisattvabhūmi* 3,5f.

[355] Canonical source: AN II, p. 66 (*idha gahapati ariyasāvako vigatamalamaccherena cetasā agāraṃ ajjhāvasati muttacāgo payatapāṇī vossaggarato yācayogo dānasaṃvibhāgarato / ayaṃ vuccati gahapati cāgasampadā*). • YBh parallels: $\text{VinSg}_{t,D}$ *zhi* 159b5, $\text{ParSg}_{t,P}$ *yi* 31b7-32a3, $\text{ParSg}_{t,D}$ *'i* 26b2ff., YBh_c 762a2ff. (復次解脫捨者, etc.). • For explanations on these expressions, see *Bodhisattvabhūmivyākhyā* (ACIP: TD4047), fol. 146b, *Sūtrasamuccayabhāṣya* (ACIP: TD3935) fol. 228a-b, Nāgārjuna's *Sūtrasamuccaya* (ACIP: TD3934, fol. 151a), and *Visuddhimagga* III.112. See also MaVyu 2843-2848. • Synonyms for the aspects of giving in ASBh 71,2-4:

Aspects of Giving According to AS 59,17-19	Synonyms Proposed in ASBh 71,2-4
aniśritadānatā (*mi gnas par sbyin pa*)	*muktatyāga*
viśadadānatā (*rgya cher sbyin pa*)	*pratatapāṇi*
pramuditadānatā (*dga' bas sbyin pa*)	*vyavasargarata*
abhīkṣṇadānatā (*phyir zhing sbyin pa*)	*yāyajūka*
pātradānatā (*snod la sbyin pa*)	*tyāgasaṃpanna*
**parigrahāgantukasaṃvibhāgadānatā* (*'khor dang / glo bur du 'ongs pa la legs par bgos te sbyin pa*)	*dāne saṃvibhāgarata*

[356] YBh parallel: $\text{ParSg}_{t,P}$ *yi* 31b7: *lhug par gtong ba ni sbyin pa dang 'bras bur mi 'brel*

ba ste / mya ngan las 'das par yongs su bsngos pa'i phyir ro /. YBh$_c$ 762a2f.: 復次解脫捨者。迴向涅槃故。於施果中無繫著故.

[357] YBh parallel: ParSg$_{t,P}$ *yi* 31b7: *lag brkyang ba ni gus pa dang rgya chen rab tu sbyin pa'o /*. YBh$_c$ 762a3: 常舒手者。殷重廣施故.

[358] YBh parallel: ParSg$_{t,P}$ *yi* 31b7-8: *rnam par gtong ba la dga' ba ni sbyin pa'i* (*yi* 31b8) *sngon rol dang / sbyin pa'i tshe dang byin zin nas yid rangs pa dang 'gyod pa med pa'o //*. YBh$_c$ 762a3-4: 樂棄捨者。施前正施及與施後意悅清淨無追悔故.

[359] YBh parallel: ParSg$_{t,P}$ *yi* 31b8-32a1: *sbyin pa ma 'chad par byed pa ni gcig tu chos dang bab bcol ma yin pas longs spyod bsgrub te dus dus su yang dang yang du sbyin* (*yi* 32a1) *par bya ba'i dngos po yongs su gtong ba'o /*. YBh$_c$ 762a4-6: 祠祀施者。一向如法不以凶暴積集財物。時時數數周遍捨施所施物故。

[360] YBh parallel: ParSg$_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a1: *gtong ba phun sum tshogs pa ni sbyin gnas dag la dbul ba'o //* (YBh$_c$ 762a6-7: 捨圓滿者。謂於福田而奉獻故). In accordance with Chinese 圓滿, Skt. *saṃpad* can have the connotation of completeness. See DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 38, n. 23.

[361] YBh parallel: ParSg$_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a1f.: *sbyin pa la 'ged par dga' ba ni dus dus su pha dang ma dang bu dang bran la sogs pa la* (32a2) *kun bged pa'o //*. YBh$_c$ 762a7f.: 於惠施中樂分布者。謂於父母妻子等所時時平等而分布故. In contrast, the reading *'gyed* is supported by ISHIHAMA and FUKUDA, *Mahāvyutpatti*, ad MaVyu 2848. • TATIA reads *dānasaṃvibhāgarata* (= SAKUMA, *Index*, s.v.) which is in accordance with AN II, p. 66 (*dānasaṃvibhāgarato*). TATIA was probably influenced by MaVyu 2848 which reads *dāna-saṃvibhāga-rata* although the Tibetan *sbyin pa la 'gyed par dga' ba* would also allow for an uncompounded *dāne*. • The locative *dāne* of ASBh$_{MS}$ is supported by ASVy$_c$ 731b25, c1 "when he gives", or "while he gives" (於正施時), and YBh$_c$ 762a7: 於施果中.

[362] Cf. MSg IV.1.1: *byang chub sems pa longs spyod rnams la kun tu ma chags pa* ("the Bodhisattva does not attach himself to wealth (/enjoyments)"). • The term *bhoktṛ* has been used to denote the one who reaps the results of past action. See LAMOTTE ("Traité de l'acte", p. 154). As the Bodhisattva does not aim at the enjoyable results of either meritorious nor immovable action, one could say that he does not aim at becoming a *bhoktṛ*. It is possible, but by no means established, that *bhoga* is used here with this implication.

[363] In Tatia's edition, there is no graphic separation of *punar* and *bhava*°. Nonetheless, both ASBh$_t$ (*srid pa*) and ASVy$_c$ 731b27 (有) indicate *bhava*, as in ASBh 72,4-5 (*bhavabhogapariṇāmitatvena*, ASVy$_c$ 732a13: 不迴向有及資財).

[364] Note that AS$_t$ translates *akuthita* as "not rotten" (*ma rul*). According to MATHEWS (*Chinese-English*, no. 2351), Chin. 穢 seems to mean "rotten, foul", and is often used in a figurative sense, as in "the foul smell rises up to heaven", 穢氣冲天. TŌDŌ,

MATSUMOTO and TAKEDA (eds., *Kanjigen*, s.v. 穢) suppose that 歳, the right-side element of the sign, indicates cereals which have been cut off and shred to pieces. Those were possibly left scattered on the ground where they decomposed.

365 The explanations of ASBh 71,4-12 match a series of five criteria for a layman's wealth that is to be found in the *Pañcabhoga-ādiyasutta* (AN III, p. 45f.; *uṭṭhānaviriyādhigatehi bhogehi bāhābalaparicitehi sedāvakkhittehi dhammikehi dhammaladdhehi*). For an interpretation of that passage in terms of economic ethics, see KAJIYOSHI, "*Keizaikan*", p. 4. See also the *Anaṇasutta* (AN II, p. 69f.). • It is bewildering that the ASBh here provides term that can be found in a sutta passage, while AS 59,19-21 provides only what seems to be the explicatory terms for that very passage. I wonder whether there is a canonical source for the AS expressions or whether the AS here uses commentarial terms for a *sūtra* formula that was so common that the AS author saw no reason to mention it.

366 It is doubtful whether the AS author actually intended "not stinking and free from dirt" to be the explanation of "thrown off [by?] sweat and dirt". MaVy 7055 actually suggests another understanding of *sveda-malāvakṣipta*: "[produced the gift] having shed sweat and dirt" (*rngul cing dri ma chags chags* [sic] *su bsgrubs pa*). The CPD explains the expression *avakkhitta-seda* as "whereby sweat has been shed, won by sweat (exertion)". While $ASBh_t$ constructs this as "not befallen by sweat and dirt" (*rngul dang dri mas ma phog pa*), $ASVy_c$ 731c11 renders the verb more literally: "Because the thing to be given is far away from dirt and pollution" (由所施物遠離汚垢染汚故). My impression is that the ASBh presents a rather unskillful interpretation of the āgamic compound.

367 Cf. MSABh 130,7f.

368 The term *dharma* seems not to refer to Buddhist doctrine here, but rather to ethical, appropriate behaviour in general (which in this case amounts to the same). On this usage of *dharma*, see SCHMITHAUSEN, "Ethik", p. 4, and HALBFASS, *Karma und Wiedergeburt*, p. 97, referring to the *Sāleyakasutta* (MN, no. 41) in which the Buddha teaches the doctrine of *karman* to two non-Buddhist brahmins. See also POTTER, "Karma Theory", p. 243, on *dharma* and *adharma* in the more general sense.

369 "Appropriate" here clearly implies suitable for being given to ascetics, inoffensive.

370 Trading with weapons, living beings, meat, intoxicants, and poison (in this order) is forbidden in the *Vaṇijjāsutta* (AN III, p. 208). According to SCHMITHAUSEN ("Ethics of Nature", p. 75, n. 234), the reason for the prohibition to trade with weapons or poison is to prevent involvement in killing.

371 The example of manipulating the scale is often used in the Pāli Canon, e.g. SN V, p. 473.

372 $ASBh_{t,P}$ reads " cheating with the balance and (!) wrong livelihood, etc." (*gzhal ba la g.yo 'jug pa la sogs pa dang log pas 'tsho ba la sogs pa*). Cf. $ASVy_c$ 731c14f.: "wrong livelihood [such as] deceiving with measures and scales (斗稱?)" (僞斗稱等邪命財).

[373] Placing "discipline" after "giving" is in accordance with a stereotype formula that can be found in the Vinaya (Vin I, pp. 15, 18, 19, etc.): *dānakathaṃ sīlakathaṃ saggakathaṃ* .... The same order is followed in $\text{ParSg}_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a3. Note that the ParSg does not mention the "Six Branches" of monastic discipline, directly starts with the explanations that are parallel to AS 60,8-22. The first item of those (after *śīla* itself) is *sdom pa*, but the ParSg is extremely brief on that point (see below). On *śīla*, the ParSg states: [...] *tshul khrims dang ldan pa zhes* (*zhes*; D: *zhes bya ba?*) *rgyas par ro // de tshul khrims ni 'chal pa'i tshul khrims kyi kha na ma tho bas kun du gdungs pa nye bar zhi bar byed pa dang / ngang tshul du bya ba'i don to //*, $\text{ParSg}_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a4. YBh_c 762a13-15: [...] 具戒等廣。說言尸羅者。謂能寂靜。毀犯淨戒罪熱惱故。又與清涼義相應故. • Also the first two of the Six Perfections are in the same order (see HIRAKAWA, *Indian Buddhism*, p. 299), but there is nothing equivalent to the other four Perfections in the following AS section. • MSg IV.6 states that giving and discipline are mentioned in that order because giving helps the arising of discipline. That is further explained in the **Mahāyānasaṃgrahopanibandhana* "The preceding one helps the arising of the latter [means]: the Bodhisattva having detached himself from riches engages in discipline." LAMOTTE (*Somme*, vol. 2, p. 185f., n. 6). • The connection between the Perfection of Giving and that of Discipline (*śīla*) is also discussed in the *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan* by means of a quotation from the *Madhyamakāvatāra* (II,4): "If a being's feet, discipline, are broken, even if he has riches due to his giving, he will fall into the bad destinies." (*skyes bu tshul khrims rkang pa chag gyur na // de sbyin pas longs spyod ldan yang ngan 'gror lhung //*, *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 134). GUENTHER's translation (*Jewel Ornament*, p. 162) is unsatisfactory: "When a human being breaks his foot, namely ethics and manners, Even if he practices liberality, he will fall into evil states of life." • The main topics that appear in the following section, AS 60,1-22, are mentioned in AN IV, no. 37. • Sūtra passages containing the stereotype formula on the discipline of a monk are frequent in canonical texts, such as the *Sāmaññaphalasutta* (DN I, p. 63). RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 95, n. 6) points to DN I, p. 250 and DN III, p. 285. DN I, p. 250 reads: *so evaṃ pabbajito samāno pātimokkhasaṃvarasaṃvuto viharati ācāragocarasampanno aṇumattesu vajjesu bhayadassāvī samādāya sikkhati sikkhāpadesu bhikkhu sīlavā hoti pātimokkha saṃvara.* In the Chinese *Samyuktāgama* (SĀ 210a26-28): 何等爲增上戒學。若比丘住於戒。波羅提木叉。律儀威儀。行處具足。見微細罪。則生怖畏。受持學戒. See also CHOI, *Dreifache Schulung*, p. 93, n. 6. It seems that the essence of those six points is alluded to in the *Dhammapada*, verse 185 (Dhp, p. 52): *anupavādo anupaghāto pātimokkhe ca saṃvaro / mattaññutā ca bhattasmiṃ pantañ ca sayanāsanaṃ / adhicitte ca āyogo etaṃ buddhāna sāsanam.* "Not disparaging, not injuring, restraint in line with the *pāṭimokkha*, moderation in food, dwelling in seclusion, commitment to the heightened mind: This is the Buddhas' teaching". THANISSARO BHIKKHU, *Wings to Awakening*, p. 37. • The full Sanskrit text is contained in *Saṅghabhedavastu*, vol. 2, p. 232,7-9. See also SHT I 613R2-3, SHT III 808V1. • Cf. *Xianyang shengjiao lun* 512a5-6: 如經中說。若諸比丘尸羅成就住。守別解脫律儀軌。則所行悉皆具足。於微細罪深見怖畏。受學學處。名具戒者. CHOI's translation (*Dreifache Schulung*, p. 60): "[...] so heißt es in den Sūtras: "Wenn Mönche so leben, daß sie mit Sittlichkeit versehen sind, wenn sie die Regeln des

Prātimokṣa beachten, wenn bei ihnen, was [Befolgung der] Regeln und Aufenthaltsorte angeht, alles vollkommen ist, wenn sie [sogar] in geringfügigen Verfehlungen zutiefst etwas Erschreckendes und Gefährliches sehen, und wenn sie sich in den Schulungspunkten (d.h. den Prātimokṣaregeln), nachdem sie sie auf sich genommen haben, schulen, dann nennt man sie [Personen, die] Sittlichkeit besitzen." ● The sūtra passage quoted in AS$_c$ and ASVy$_c$ 731c16-18 (如契經說。成就尸羅。...) is missing in all the Tibetan versions (AS$_t$, ASVy$_t$), wherefore I assume that it was not included in the Sanskrit AS or ASVy. It is also not contained in the ASBh and ASBh$_t$. The formula was possibly so widely known that the author felt no need to include it in the AS (see the note on *Śrāvakabhūmi*, p. 47, below). ● Interestingly, the sūtra quotation is contained only in abbreviated form in the Sanskrit version of the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, p. 47: *tatra śīlasaṃvaraḥ katamaḥ / yathāpīhaikatyaḥ śīlavān viharati, yāvat samādāya śikṣate śikṣāpadeṣu //* (my punctuation follows CHOI, *Dreifache Schulung*, p. 149). The Tibetan version of the *Śrāvakabhūmi* in contrast contains all six points: *de la tshul khrims kyi sdom pa gang zhe na / 'di na la la tshul khrims dang ldan par gnas pa dang / so sor thar pa'i sdom pas bsdams pa dang / cho ga phun sum tshogs pa dang / spyod yul phun sum tshogs pa dang / kha na ma tho ba phra rab tsam dag la yang 'jigs par lta ba dang / bslab pa'i gzhi rnams yang dag par blangs shing slob par byed pa yin no /* (quoted, omitting alternate readings, after CHOI, op. cit., p. 183). ● According to a note by DPANG LO, those six aspects of discipline (i.e. *blangs pa, so so thar pa'i sdom pa, cho ga, spyod yul, kha na ma tho ba, bslab pa'i gzhi*) are called "The Six Branches" (*yan lag drug*) in a text called *The Ornament* (*brgyad pa la gnyis kyi tshul khrims drug bshad rgyan du yan lag drug ces*, AS-dPang-lo, fol. 247b3). This refers to the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*, XVI.19-20. ● Also BU STON is acquainted with those "Six Branches of Discipline" (*tshul khrims kyi yan lag drug*, AS-Bu-ston, p. 558,4), but he does not indicate any source. ● TSONG KHA PA teaches in his *Legs bshad gser phreng* that the six aspects of discipline (see above) have to be observed when practicing each of the Six Perfections (*sbyin pa la drug tshang bar sgrub pa de bzhin du tshul khrims drug ldan du srung bar byed do// de ltar gzhan rnams la yang sbyar ro //*, *Legs bshad gser phreng*, fol. 233b).

374 According to DPANG LO, the first of the Six Branches, "having acquired" (*blangs pa*) consists in observing the vows of a fully ordained monk, and so on (*blangs pa ni dge slong gi sdom pa sogs te ma nyams par rjes su srung ba'o //*, AS-dPang-lo, fol. 247b3). ● See also YBh$_c$ 590c24-28: 問苾芻近事近住律儀。當知各由幾支所攝。答苾芻律儀四支所攝。何等爲四。一受具足支。二受隨法學處支。三隨護他心支。四隨護如所受學處支。若作表白第四羯磨。及略攝受。隨麤學處。是名受具足支。

375 ASVy$_c$ 731c18-19 uses two different terms to render *śīla*: the transcription 尸羅 in the interrogatory sentence (*śīlavān*: 成就尸羅), and the translation 淨戒 in the explanatory sentence (*śīlaṃ samādāya*: 受持淨戒).

376 For the tense of the Tibetan verb, cf. AS-Bu-ston, p. 558,5: *rjes su srung ba.*

377 Reconstruction *samādattaśīlā* according to ŚrBh 44,5,7.

378 Cf. *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (WOGIHARA ed.), p. 138. *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 136: *de*

ltar yang byang sa las / de la byang chub sems dpa'i tshul khrims ni / so sor thar pa'i sdom pa yang dag par blangs pa / ris bdun po /. GUENTHER, *Jewel Ornament*, p. 165: "As is stated in the Byaṅ.sa ('Bodhisattvabhūmi'): The ethics of the Bodhisattva discipline are to accept that of the Prātimokṣa. Its seven sections are [...]'." The expression *ris bdun po*, nonetheless, refers to seven groups of persons observing the restraints (see above, AS 57,5-7).

[379] • AKBh 207,17f. deals with the interpretative etymology of "*prātimokṣa*", AKBh 207,18 with that of "*prātimokṣasaṃvara*". The latter is basically an explanation of "restraint" (*saṃvara*) by means of allusion to a sūtra expression: "[It is] also called 'Prātimokṣa restraint' because it restrains the body and the speech" (*prātimokṣasaṃvara ity api kāyavāksaṃvaraṇāt /*).

[380] Reconstruction °*saṃvṛto bhavati* according to ŚrBh 37,14.

[381] Reconstruction *nairyāṇikaśīlatā* according to ŚrBh 44,5, 8f. See CHOI, *Dreifache Schulung*, p. 156.

[382] ASVy$_c$ 731c22-23: "Because that restraint (律儀) separates him far (能速出離) from the suffering of *saṃsāra*" (由此律儀能速出離生死苦故).

[383] The *Śrāvakabhūmi* (ŚrBh 38,2) defines "excellent in conduct" (*ācārasaṃpanna*) in rather general terms as ascetic conduct, undertaking what is wholesome (*kuśalapakṣaprayoga*), a conduct (*ācāra*) that follows mundane and monastic conventions, etc. This is followed by a discussion of the terms used in the definition. See Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group, *First Chapter*, pp. 64-67. • DPANG LO: "'Conduct' is [1. that consisting in] acts that immediately [belong to daily] conduct (*kun spyod de 'phral gyi bya ba*), [2. that] of [bodily] attitudes (*spyod lam*), and [3. that of] application to what is wholesome. That those are excellent [means that they are] not reproached by the supreme ones" (*cho ga ni kun spyod de 'phral gyi bya ba'i dang / spyod lam gyi dang / dge ba la sbyor ba'i 'o // de phun sum tshogs pa dam pa rnams kyis ma smad pa'o //*, AS-dPang-lo, fol. 247b3). At least the three terms ("application to what is wholesome", *dge ba la sbyor ba*, etc.) are clearly parallel to ŚrBh 38,2 (*kuśalapakṣaprayoga*, etc.).

[384] Cf. ASVy$_c$ 731c25: "the wise men" (聰慧人).

[385] From the ASBh explanations it is clear that *gocara* refers to places one frequents. BHSD, CDP, and SWTF (s.v. *gocara, ācāragocara*) rather propose "associations", i.e. the company one keeps. The Pāli Vinaya commentary *Suttavibhaṅga* explains that a monk should not construct his hut *near* such troublesome places as taverns and so on (see SCHMITHAUSEN, *Sentience of Plants*, pp. 26-30). Ultimately, the monk should try to avoid such places and social constellations. • DPANG LO follows the terminology of the ASBh for the first three forbidden locations. His translation of the last two, however, is mixed up, reading *rgyal po'i khyim dang rgyal po'i pho brang* (AS-dPang-lo, fol. 247b4) instead of ASBh$_t$: *rgyal po'i pho brang dang / gdol pa'i khyim*. Otherwise, his explanations on "excellent location" basically follow the ASBh. • In BO DONG PHYOGS LAS RNAM RGYAL's commentary, only four forbidden locations are listed, but a set of five places referred to: *bsod [sic] pa dang / smad mtshong [sic] ma dang / gdol pa'i khyims*

[sic] dang / rgyal po ngan pa'i pho brang spangs pas spyod (*spyod* inserted by a later hand) *yul ma yin pa lnga spangs pa* [...]. AS-Bo-dong-bShad, p. 630,4-5. I consider the omission of the tavern to be one of the many scribal errors in this text.

386 In the translations or the ASBh and ASVy, the term *ghoṣa* has either been understood as "place of slaughter" (*shan pa'i gnas*, ASBh$_t$) or as "musician's house" (ASVy$_c$. For this translation of 唱令家, see CHOI, *Dreifache Schulung*, p. 97, n. 61: "Haus der Sänger und Musikanten", and LUO, *Hanyu dacidian*, s.v. I am not absolutely sure whether that interpretation of 唱令 is accurate.). The latter interpretation is supported by the *Lung phran tshegs kyi rnam par bshad pa* (ACIP TD4115), fol. 182b, which reads "a place of music [means] a place of musicians" (*rol mo'i gnas ni rol mo mkhan gyi gnas*). ▪ MAYRHOFER (*Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, s.v.) presents "a herdsman's station", "a herdsman's encampment" among the meanings of *ghoṣa* (see also BÖHTLINGK and ROTH, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, s.v.). This is followed by Takashi MAEDA ("Ābhiprāyikārthagāthānirdeśa", p. 77: "herdsman's camp", 牧人の屯所) in his translation of the *Ābhiprāyikārthagāthānirdeśa* section from the YBh, even though the explanation of the respective passage reads "there, *ghoṣa* has to be regarded as *sūnā* (slaughterhouse, butchery)" (*tatra ghoṣaḥ sūnā draṣṭavyā*). With reference to that very passage, the Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group (*First Chapter*, p. 67) has decided to translate *ghoṣa* as "a butcher's house" (屠殺者の家). ▪ I provisionally assume that *ghoṣa* originally meant a "a herdsman's station", but at the time the *Ābhiprāyikārthagāthānirdeśa* was produced, it had come to mean "a slaughterhouse", or "a place where animals are slaughtered". During that process, it is quite possible that there was neither a change in what this word referred to, nor in what actually happened in those places. There might have been just a shift in the perception and judgement of animal slaughter. "A musician's place" could be either a simple misinterpretation of *ghoṣa* (which also means "sound"), or an indication that various lower castes (not only meat producers) lived in those places. ▪ Note that *shan pa'i gnas* (ASBh$_t$) could be interpreted as "an executioner's place", while BO DONG speaks of "a killer" (AS-Bo-dong-bShad 630,5: *bsod pa,* read: *gsod pa*). The specification of animal slaughter might have been unsuitable for the situation in Tibet.

387 The Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group (*First Chapter*, p. 66) reads *veśyaṃ pānāgāro*, for *veśaṃ* [...] in the ŚrBh$_{MS}$, with reference to SHUKLA's edition (*veśyāpānā...*) and ASBh 71,16 (*veśaḥ pānāgāraṃ*). The reading *veśaḥ* seems preferable. • ASVy$_c$ 731c27: "a house of lewd women" (婬女家). CHOI (*Dreifache Schulung*, p. 62) translates the same term as "Haus verführerischer Frauen".

388 The equation of a royal court with low-caste or outcaste houses could lead the Buddhist order into serious trouble. This is why, I assume, BO DONG PHYOGS LAS RNAM RGYAL softened this point into "the palace of an *evil* king" (*rgyal po ngan pa'i pho brang*, AS-Bo-dong-bShad, p. 630,5). • Buddhist monks did indeed visit the royal court. For example the monk Nāgasena's legendary visit to king Milinda (*Milindapañha* II, ch. 1) was to my knowledge not ever criticized. • ASVy$_c$ 731c27: "royal court" (王家). Cf. CHOI, loc. cit.: "Königspalast".

389 How *kaṭhina* came to mean "hut" (BHSD, s.v.) in Buddhist texts is unclear. See also

---

CHOI, *Dreifache Schulung*, p. 97, n. 62. • ASVy$_c$ 731c27: As in the *Hsien yang shen chiao lun* and the YBh, XUANZANG only transcribes *kaṭhina* (羯恥那) and adds 家. See CHOI, loc. cit.

390 DPANG LO: "Vice [means]: [1.] cutting grass and the like that are a fault because the Teacher has established them [as faults. These are] proclaimed (*bcas pa*) [vices]. And [2.] the ten unwholesome [paths of action] that are a fault even if there is no proclamation (*bcas pa*). [These are] the natural [vices]." (*kha na ma tho ba ni / rts[w]a gcod pa sogs lta bu ston pas bzhag pa'i dbang las nyes par 'gyur ba bcas pa dang mi dge ba bcu bcas pa med kyang nyes par 'gyur ba rang bzhin no //*, AS-dPang-lo, fol. 247b5). I cannot judge in how far the spelling *rtsa* is accurate. It is the reading preferred by ISHIHAMA and FUKUDA (*Mahāvyutpatti*, pp. 259, 266) ad MaVyu 5392, 5545 (D reading) against P *rtswa*. Cf. DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 362, n. 55. • DPANG LO then refers to the explanations in the *Vyākhyāyukti* (D 4061, *shi* 96b1-5) and the AKBh (probably AKBh 219,1f.) to the effect that the Buddha pointed out the proclaimed vices so that one may give up other vices connected to them (AS-dPang-lo, fol. 247b6). On proclaimed and natural vices, see, e.g., the *'Dul ba bsdu ba* (D 4040, fols. 7a7-7b2). See also TATZ, *Chapter on Ethics*, p. 10 and SCHMITHAUSEN, *Sentience of Plants*, p. 16, n. 93.

391 For *tīvra* (AS$_t$ *shin tu*; ASBh$_t$ *bsam pa*) the Chinese reads 勇猛 "decided, brave, heroic, manly". That term is used for various Sanskrit words. Nonetheless, the YBh-Index-CST does not list *tīvra* among the equivalents. The Chinese AS translator may either have read *vīrya*, or he wanted to stress the aspect of strength (of will or decision). • The equivalent of *gaurava* in Tibetan (*gus pa*) is normally translated as "devotion", while the Chinese (恭敬) indicates a deferential comportment (NAKAMURA, et al., *Iwanami bukkyōjiten*, s.v.: うやうやしくつつしむこと). • The Tibetan translation (*bsam pa drag pos bslab pas*) differs from the Skt. and from AS 60,5-6, where the Tibetan reads *shin tu gus par slob pa'i*. Cf. also ASVy$_c$ 731c29-732a1: 於遮罪中勇猛恭敬修學護持。猶如性罪. Also here, the aspect (strength of) will or decision is stressed.

392 AS$_t$ seems read a misplaced *daṇḍa*: **katham samādāya śikṣate / śikṣāpadeṣu paripūrṇaṃ śikṣā śīlatvāt /*. But AS$_c$ reads 於諸學處善能受學 (**samādāya śikṣate śikṣapādeṣu*). • Reconstruction according to ŚrBh 41,19. See also ŚrBh 37,8f., and DN I, p. 250, l. 24: *samādāya sikkhati sikkhāpadesu*.

393 Reconstruction *śikṣaṇa* according to AS$_c$ (所學), although AS$_{t,P}$ proposes *śikṣāpada* (*bslab pa'i gzhi*).

394 This phrase is an interpretation of the syllable *sam* in *samādāna* (Tib. *yang dag par blangs pa*). Skt. *sam* here indicates completeness: "completely" (*samantāt*, Tib. *kun nas*), and I translate *paripūrṇam* (Tib. *yongs su rdzogs par*) here freely as "in every respect", to avoid repetition and in absence of an English expression "*completely fully". Nonetheless, I translate *samādāna* as "taking up" as I think *sam* does not necessarily have such a strong meaning as the commentary suggests here.

395 AS$_c$ has included the explanations on the structure of the text that appear in ASBh

71,20 (從是已後依止尸羅。釋佛經中護身等義。). The sentence is identical in AS_c and $ASVy_c$ 732a4.

[396] The following section (AS 60,8-22) deals with the description of exemplary behaviour (*samudācāra*) based on a standard formula that appears at ŚrBh 134,1f, *Bodhisattvabhūmi* 101,4 (*anulomikair ānucchavikair aupayikaiḥ pratirūpaiḥ pradakṣinaiḥ*), $ParSg_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a4-b1 ($ParSg_{t,D}$ *'i* 26b8-27a2, YBh_c 762a14-27), MaVyu 7018-7022. • DPANG LO: "In order to explain the conduct (*kun spyod*) of body and speech that appears in the sūtra, there are fourteen [items]: [...]." (*lus ngag gi kun spyod mdo sder 'byung ba bshad pa la bcu bzhi ste /*, AS-dPang-lo, fol. 248a2). • In this context of behaviour, the word *samudācāra* seems to have a strong connotation of visible, perceivable, acute demanour or bearing, in contrast to, for example, a monk's long-term prospects on the Path.

[397] The Tibetan translations either render the accusative as such (*la brtsams nas*), or as ablative (*las brtsams nas*). The following chart shows those variations:

ārabhya (ASBh 71,20)	*las brtsams nas* $ASBh_{t,PGDC}$ *las brtsams pa nas* $ASBh_{t,N}$	*las brtsams nas* $ASVy_{t,PD}$
ārabhya (ASBh 72,13)	*la brtsams nas* $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$	*las brtsams nas* $ASVy_{t,PD}$
ārabhya (ASBh 72,14)	*la brtsams nas* $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$	*la brtsams na* $ASVy_{t,PD}$
ārabhya (ASBh 72,23)	*las* [...] *brtsams nas* $ASBh_{t,PNGDC}$	*las* [...] *brtsams te* $ASVy_{t,PD}$

[398] Cf. MSg VI.3: *byang chub sems dpa' rnams kyi tshul khrims ni lus dang ngag dang sems kyi nyid do // nyan thos rnams kyi ni lus dang ngag gi nyid do //.* "La moralité (*śīla*) des Bodhisattva est d'ordre corporel (*kāyika*), vocal (*vācika*) et mental (*manasa*); celle des Śrāvaka ne s'étend qu'au corps et à la voix." LAMOTTE , *Somme*, vol. 2, p. 214. But *Dhammapada*, verse 233 reads: *manasā saṃvuto siyā* (*Udānavarga* VII.10: *manasā saṃvṛta dhīrā*). See also SCHMITHAUSEN, "Bodhisattva-Ethik", p. 21, n. 3.

[399] Canonical sources: Cf. I.a) *Dhammapada*, verse 231: *kāyena saṃvuto siyā* (*Udānavarga* VII.10: *kāyena saṃvṛtā dhīrā[ḥ]*), I.b) *Dhammapada*, verse 232: *vācāya saṃvuto siyā* (*Udānavarga* VII.10: *dhīrā vācā susaṃvṛt ā[ḥ]*). • YBh parallel: $ParSg_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a4-5: *sdom pa ni spong ba'i rang* (P 32a5) *bzhin no //.* YBh_c 762a15-16: 言律儀者。謂是遠離自體相故. • See also TATZ, *Chapter on Ethics*, pp. 12, 49.

[400] $ASBh_t$ *'gro ba dang / ldog pa la sogs pa*; $ASVy_c$ 732a6: "coming and going and so on" (往來等). • Canonical sources: MN I, p. 57 (*Satipaṭṭhānasutta*): *puna ca paraṃ bhikkhave bhikkhu abhikkante paṭikkante sampajānakārī hoti, ālokite vilokite sampajanakārī hoti ....* ("Furthermore, when advancing and returning, Bhikṣus, the Bhikṣu makes himself fully aware, when looking at [something] and looking away the

Bhikṣu makes himself fully aware, ..."). • YBh parallel: ŚrBh 11,11, and 111,11f.

401 The mention of *saṃyagvartanāt* seems to imply an "etymological" element (*nirukti*), as if *saṃvṛta* (belonging to *sam-/vṛ*) were derived from *sam-/vṛt*.

402 ASVy$_c$ 732a6: 如佛所聽.

403 YBh parallel: ParSg$_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a5: *phun sum tshogs pa ni 'gyod pa med pa yongs su 'dzin pa'o //*. YBh$_c$ 762a16: 言具足者。謂正攝受無悔等故.

404 AS$_c$, ASVy$_c$ 732a7: "he never commits [the offences] that can be committed" (終不毀犯所毀犯). • AS-Bu-ston, p. 559,2: "The nature (*ngo bo*) is that the discipline is not spoiled. Because he does not commit a downfall (*ltung ba*) through the three doors (i.e. body, speech, and mind)" (*ngo bo sgo gsum gyis ltung ba mi byed pas khrims chud mi gson pa'o*). BU STON here uses the ASBh$_t$ phrasing *ltung ba mi byed* and not ASVy$_t$ *ltung bas mi gnod*. • The ASVy$_t$ reading *ltung bas mi gnod* can be understood in a passive sense: "because he is not harmed through downfalls", which would imply that NYI MA RGYAL MTSHAN took *adhyāpanna* in a passive sense. Otherwise *ltung bas mi gnod* can be translated as "because he does not harm [the discipline] through downfalls". It seems that the degree of activity or passivity of Skt. *āpatti* (from *ā-/pat*, "fall out, come flying") and Tib. *ltung ba* ("downfall", as a verb "fall") plays a role here, i.e., in other words the offensiveness of the offence. See also CPD (s.v. *āpatti*).

405 The ASBh here continues the *figura etymologica* of the AS which contains three different forms of the verb */pad* with various prefixes. In the ASBh explanation, *sam-panna* is explained by means of a double negation: *a-vi-panna*. • ASVy$_c$ 732a8: "Because he does not violate (違損) the pure discipline" (謂不違損清淨尸羅。).

406 TATIA has chosen to follow the MS and not to execute the sandhi between the theme and the explication here. This is, nonetheless, a phenomenon that occurs often in the MS and is normally changed without notice by TATIA and myself.

407 YBh parallel: ParSg$_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a5: *kun tu spyod pa yongs su dag pa ni ting nge 'dzin yongs su 'dzin pa'o //*, YBh$_c$ 762a17: 言清淨者。攝受現行三摩地故.

408 "Absence of regret and so on" (*avipratisārādi*) refers to a set of five factors by means of which discipline (*śīla*) is conducive to concentration (*samādhi*). By keeping the discipline, one does not commit unwholesome actions, one is thus free from regret and able to begin meditating with more peace of mind, which leads to the next factor (pleasure, *prāmodya*), etc, and finally to *samādhi*. This is of course a crucial point in the Buddhist exposition of *karman*, for it shows how even worldly wholesome behaviour can be conducive to the contemplative path to liberation. See DELHEY, *Samāhitā Bhūmiḥ*, p. 395 (ad MS 63b4) and, e.g., the *Cetanāsutta* (AN V, p. 313f.). Nonetheless, our AS passage is slightly ambiguous in so far as it is not really clear whether "Absence of regret and so on" by means of discipline are the immediate cause for (or, equivalent to) purified conduct of body and speech, or whether concentration (*samādhi*) is its cause (or equivalent). The ASBh explanations below indicate the latter: concentration counteracts bad discipline. The idea behind the ambivalent phrasing in the AS was possibly that

discipline and concentration were considered mutually reinforcing factors. At AS 9,18f., for example, distraction (*vikṣepa*) is defined as a diffusion (*visāra*) of the mind that is part of (*-aṃśika*) desire, hatred and delusion (*vikṣepaḥ katamaḥ / rāgadveṣamohāṃśikaś cetaso visāraḥ /*, almost identical phrasing at TrBh 32,7). It would therefore logically follow that concentration, being directed against distraction (*vikṣepa*), is implicitly directed against the three unwholesome roots and the resulting lack of discipline (*śīla*). See also HARVEY, "Unwholesomeness", p. 141. ● See also CHOI, *Dreifache Schulung*, p. 68 and p. 105f., ns. 168-180, on the same set of five in the *Xianyang shengjiao lun* 513a29-513b2: 謂由尸羅成就故無悔。由無悔故生悅。生悅故心喜。心喜故身安。身安故受樂。受樂故心定。心定故 [...]. ● $ASVy_c$ 732a9: 無悔等漸次修行久至得定. ● Concerning *avipratisārādi°*, Bu ston explains that the word *ādi* refers to a workable mind, remaining in *samādhi* with ease, etc., i.e. the well-known fivefold list (*sogs kyi sgras sems las su rung ba ste / bde bar mnyam par gzhag pas ting nge 'dzin la gnas shing* [...]), AS-Bu-ston, p. 559,2. ● AS-dPang-lo, fol. 248a3-4: "As for 'purified', it is said in the sūtra: 'When one is endowed with discipline, one is without regret'. Therefore, one does not have regret due to downfalls. And therefore one makes distant the corrupted discipline that one has abandoned before by means of the concentration that arises from the absorption with a happy mind [due to absence of regret]. Because of that [the conduct of body and speech is purified] (*dag pa ni mdor / tshul khrims dang ldan na 'gyod pa med par 'gyur ro zhes 'byung bas ltung bas 'gyod pa med pas yid bde bar mnyam par bzhag pa las byung ba'i ting nge 'dzin gyis 'chal ba'i tshul khrims sngar spangs pa thag bsrings pa'i phyir ro //*)."

409 Or, for *avipratisārādikramena*, reconstruct *avipratisārādyānupūrvyā*?

410 I originally considered to reconstruct *yāvatsamādhisaṃniśrayatayā*, in accordance with $AS_{t,D}$ (*ting nge 'dzin gyi bar...*), AS_c (乃至得...) $ASVy_c$ 732a9: 久至得定...). Against those readings, there is nothing in $AS_{t,PNG}$, in the ASBh (all versions) or in DPANG LO's commentary that would indicate "*yāvat*". I rather assume that the original phrasing of $AS_{t,D}$ and AS_c was an attempt to render °*kramena*, the instrumental of which was used in an ambivalent way by the AS author, expressing "by means of the steps..." rather than the more common "stepwise." If that is correct, a Tibetan translation **rim pas* might have made that nuance more clear. Anyhow, I assume that the ASVy had *yāvat*, as also $ASVy_{t,D}$ reads *ting nge 'dzin gyi bar*.

411 Instead of *thag bsring*, AS-Bu-ston, p. 559,2-3, reads: *thag bsrings*.

412 YBh parallel: $ParSg_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a5: *dge ba ni 'bras bu yid du 'ong ba yongs su 'dzin pa'o //*. YBh_c 762a17-18: 又言善者。謂能攝受可愛果故. ● Canonical sources: See MN II, p. 115: *katamo pana, bhante, kāyasamācāro kusalo? yo kho, mahārāja, kāyasamācāro anavajjo. katamo pana, bhante, kāyasamācāro anavajjo? yo kho, mahārāja, kāyasamācāro avyāpajjho.*

413 AS_c, $ASVy_c$ 732a10: "extremely wholesome" (極善).

414 YBh parallels: 1) $ParSg_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a5-6: *kha* (P 32a6) *na ma tho ba med pa ni bdag dang gzhan la phan pa yongs su 'dzin pa'o //*. YBh_c 762a18-19: 言無罪者。謂能攝受自他利故.

• WOGIHARA, *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, p. 187,6f: *praṇidhāya brahmacaryāvāsānabhyugamanā[t]*. TATZ, *Chapter on Ethics*, p. 88: "not consenting to live celibate out of aspirations to divinity." Cf. DUTT, *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, 128,20: *brahmacaryāvāsānābhyugamanā[t]*. DUTT (*ibid.*, footnote 1), notes that the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* MS wrongly reads *caryākārānā*°. • The wrong attitude of living a celibate life out of [mundane] aspirations is, according to the VinSg, the doctrine of the non-Buddhists (*phyi rol pa rnams kyi bstan pa ni phyin ci log pa yin te / smon nas tshangs par spyod pa la gnas pa'i phyir //*, VinSg$_{t,D}$ *zhi* 266b4). • DPANG LO rather invokes the story of Nanda (*gcung dga' bo*), who initially kept the vows in order to attain rebirth in the gods realm. That behaviour was then criticised by the Buddha. See AS-dPang-lo, fol. 248a4f. (*kha na ma tho ba ste smad du med pa ...*).

[415] Skt. *anavadya* means "blameless", "without blame", or "without what is blameworthy". I translate *avadya* (lit. "what is blameworthy") as "vice".

[416] I translate *praṇihita* as "out of aspiration for". Literally it means "after having made a resolve [to strive] for".

[417] "Being praised" (*praśastatva*) here explains "not to be blamed" (*anavadya*).

[418] ASVy$_c$ 732a14: "wise sages" (聖賢). Cf. ASVy$_c$ 731c25: 聰慧人.

[419] YBh parallel: ParSg$_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a6: *gnod pa med pa ni mtshon cha len pa dang / dbyug pa len pa dang / 'thab mo dang / mtshang 'bru ba la sogs pa dang mi mthun par gnas pa'o //*. YBh$_c$ 762a19-20: 言無害者。謂能違拒執持刀杖鬥諍等事.

[420] YBh parallel: ParSg$_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a6-7: *rjes su* (P 32a7) *mthun pa ni dge sbyong gi 'bras bu dang yon tan khyad par can 'thob pa'i rjes su mthun pa'o //*. YBh$_c$ 762a20f.: 言隨順者。隨順證得諸沙門果及餘所有勝功德故. • Canonical sources: AN I, p. 106: *anulomike kāyakamme samādapeti, anulomike vacīkamme samādapeti, anulomikesu dhammesu samādapeti.* • The Sanskrit prose uses alliteration (*ānulomika*, *anuprāpti*, *anukūla*), a stylistic device that is only remotely rendered in the Tibetan (*rjes su mthun pa ... dang mthun pa*) or Chinese (隨順 ... 隨順) translations.

[421] Tib. *rjes su mthun pa* can also mean "to support; conducive" (ERB, *Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti*, p. 96: "fördern"). See, e.g. AS-Bu-ston, p. 559,3-4: "Because it benefits on the Noble Path it is conducive (*rjes su mthun pa*)" (*'phags lam la phan pas rjes su mthun pa*). Cf. AS$_c$ "in due course" (隨順), which is actually the more common meaning of *ānulomika*.

[422] YBh parallel: ParSg$_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a7: *rjes su 'phros* (*'phros*; D *'phrod?*) *pa ni dge ba mi spyoms pa'o //*. YBh$_c$ 762a21f.: 言隱覆者。謂常隱覆自善法故. • YBh parallel: *Bodhisattvabhūmi* 99,18: *praticchannakalyāṇo bhavati vivṛtapāpaḥ*.

[423] Cf. BoBhū 101,4: *ānucchavika*; MaVyu 2175: *ānucchavikaḥ* (*'phrod pa, 'byor ba*). • AS$_c$, ASVy$_c$ 732a18: "hides and reveals in accordance [what is appropriate]" (隨隱顯). • AS-Bu-ston, p. 559,4: *rjes su 'byor ba.*

[424] AS$_{t,P}$ reading *spyoms* supported by AS-Bu-ston, p. 559,4.

[425] ASVy$_t$ 251b4 differs altogether: "Because he confesses his faults and conceals his virtues." (*rang gi nyes pa mthol zhing yon tan 'chab pa'i phyir ro //*). Cf. ASVy$_c$ 732a19: "He hides his virtues and reveals his faults" (謂隱自功德顯自過失). • AS-dPang-lo, fol. 248a6: "because he hides what is wholesome and proclaims his sins" (*rang gi dge ba sbed cing sdig pa sgrogs pa'i phyir*). • AS-gZhan-dga', fol. 119b2f.: "because he does not exhibit his virtues to others and does not conceal his sins" (*dge ba gzhan mi phyoms (read: spyoms) dang sdig pa mi 'chab pa'i phyir*). MKHAN PO GZHAN DGA' combines ASBh$_t$ and ASVy$_t$ readings here. The lacking of *la* after *gzhan* is disturbing.

[426] ASBh$_{T,MS}$ *°[a]viṣkambhaṇa°*. SAKUMA accepts this reading (*Index*, s.v. *sva-doṣa-guṇa-aviṣkambhana-chādana-artha*). The ASVy$_c$ reading 顯 is listed as an equivalent for *āviṣkartā* in YBh-Index-CST (s.v. 顯).

[427] YBh parallel: ParSg$_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a7: *thabs ni sdig pa 'chags pa'o //*. YBh$_c$ 762a22: 言顯發者。謂常發露自惡法故.

[428] AS$_c$, ASVy$_c$ 732a19: "friendly, agreeable" (親善).

[429] On *brahmacarya*, see above, AS 56,9-11.

[430] ASVy$_c$ 732a20 repeats the explanations of the ASBh (同梵行者攝受尸羅故。謂同梵行攝受尸羅). This does not occur in ASVy$_t$. • Also in BU STON's commentary, the meaning of *tshangs pa mtshungs par spyod pa* is not made explicit. AS-Bu-ston, p. 559,4-5: *bsten na yon tan 'phel bas nye bar 'gro bya'i 'os yin pas tshangs sogs so /*.

[431] The ASBh here provides an etymological explanation of *aupayika*, derived from *upāya*, which in turn belongs to the verb "go near, go to" (*upa-/i*). It is explained by means of *upagamana* which derives from the verb *upa-/gam*.

[432] YBh parallel: ParSg$_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a7-8: *'tsham pa ni 'dod pa chung ba la sogs* (P 32a7) *pa dge sbyong rgyan* (*rgyan*; D: *gi rgyan*?) yongs *su 'dzin pa'o //*. YBh$_c$ 762a23f.: 言端嚴者。謂具攝受諸少欲等所有沙門莊嚴具故.

[433] AS$_c$, ASVy$_c$ 732a21 "venerable ones and those of the rank of a venerable one" (尊尊位). But XUANZANG also presents a more explicit translation in ASVy$_c$ 732a22: "venerable masters and those who equal venerable masters" (尊長及等尊長).

[434] The Tibetan versions diverge on the rendering of **pratirūpa*: AS$_t$ *'tsham pa*, ASVy$_t$: *la 'tsham pa*. ASBh$_t$: *'tshams med pa* is more probably a scribal error than a (wrong) decision of the translators. See also ISHIHAMA, *Mahāvyutpatti*, no. 6765. JÄSCHKE, *Tibetan-English Dictionary* (s.v.) reads "*'tsham(s) pa*". • AS$_c$ 應; ASVy$_c$ 732a21 應儀.

[435] YBh parallel: ParSg$_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a8: *mthun pa ni lta ba dang kun tu spyod pa dang 'tsho ba phun sum tshogs pa yongs su 'dzin pa'o //*. YBh$_c$ 762a24f.: 言福田者。攝受正見軌範淨命圓滿德故.

[436] Skt. *dṛṣṭi* in Buddhism often carries a negative connotation. BHSD (s.v.).

[437] YBh parallel: $\text{ParSg}_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a8: *gdung ba med pa ni lus ngal ba'i mtha' spong ba'o //*. YBh_c 762a25: 言無熱者。謂正遠離自苦邊故.

[438] My translation of *adhimukti* ("adherence to") follows the definition of *adhimokṣa* in the sense of adhering to what one has ascertained (*niścite vastuni yathāniścayam dhāraṇā*, AS 6,5; to the same effect: AS_c 欲解; see also SAKURABE, *Bukkyōgo no kenkyū*, p. 35). Nonetheless, *adhimukti* also carries connotations of "faith", "conviction", "longing" or "striving for" and other which are only inadequately expressed by "adherence to". See SCHMITHAUSEN, *Nirvāṇa-Abschnitt*, p. 179f., n. 263. The aspect of "striving for" or "aspiration for" (see BHSD, s.v. *adhimukti*) is stressed by REEVES ("Appropriate Means", p. 258, n. 5) and SILK (as quoted in DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 472, n. 15: "zealously applies his attention"), that of faith by MATHES (*Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, p. 278: "Hingabe") and (DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 472, n. 15: "becoming convinced"). For a discussion of *adhimokṣa* and related terms, see *ibid.*, pp. 470-473, n. 15. Cf. also below, ASBh 73,20.

[439] ASVy_c 732a26 explicitly states that this kind of adherence belongs to the non-Buddhists (外道).

[440] Canonical source: MN I, p. 342. • My translation of *tapas* as "asceticism", and *tapta* as "tormented" does not render the etymological relation between those terms (cf. Tibetan *dka' thub* and *gdung ba*). The same applies to my rendering of **ananutāpya* ("not to be regretted"), AS 60,20f. • AS_c translates *atapta* quite literally as "without heat" (無熱). Cf. AS_t *gdung ba med pa*. • BU STON mentions the asceticism of the five fires and the matted hair of the ascetics as examples (*me lnga sogs / dka' thub dang skra 'bal sogs brtul zhugs ngan ngon sogs so //*, AS-Bu-ston, p. 559,5)

[441] Skt. *ātma*: ASBh_t *bdag*, ASVy_t *rgyud*; ASVy_c 自. • ASVy_c 732a26-27: "Because he does not burn (/roast) himself" (不自燒然故), literally rendering *tapas* as heat.

[442] YBh parallel: $\text{ParSg}_{t,P}$ *yi* 32a8-b1: *nye bar gdung ba med pa ni* (32b1) *'dod pa'i bsod nams lhur len pa'i mtha' spong ba'o //*. YBh_c 762a26: 言無惱者。遠離受用欲樂邊故. • The rendering of *anutāpya* in AS_t (*phyis 'gyod pa*, "later regret") reflects the gerundive more explicitly than the equivalent found in the YBh Index (*'gyod pa*). But the former rendering is difficult to understand without knowledge of the Sanskrit term.

[443] AS-Bu-ston, p. 559,6: "Abandon the wealth of one's home, and occupations like searching for riches (*nor tshol*), agricultural work, trading, and so on" (*khyim gyi longs spyod dang / las kyi mtha' nor tshol ba / zhing las / tshong las spong sogs so //*).

[444] $\text{ASVy}_{t,D}$ (*br+ms*) is illegible in the Tibetan Tripitaka edition, but it is clearly *brtsams* in the TBRC *par phud* edition.

[445] YBh parallel: $\text{ParSg}_{t,P}$ yi 32ab1: *'gyod pa med pa ni nyon mongs pa can la mngon par mi dga' nas sred par gyur pa spong ba'o //*. YBh_c 762a26f.: 言無悔者。謂正遠離染污不樂憂慼事故.

446 AS$_t$ *chog par mi 'dzin pa*; AS$_c$, ASVy$_c$ 732a29 不以爲喜; ASVy$_c$ 732b1 不生喜足. As above, XUANZANG offers a more readable equivalent in his translation of the ASBh text.

447 See, e.g. ŚrBh, p. 66: "conduct that is based on a preparation [which consists in factors] that belong to the [realm of] the wholesome" (*kuśalapakṣaprayogādhiṣṭhāna ācāraḥ*). Also in the VinSg "accumulating [factors] that belong to the [realm of] the wholesome in one's mental continuum" (*sems kyi rgyud la dge ba'i phyogs bsags pa'o //*, VinSg$_{t,P}$ 119a5) is a major component of the path that leads to the complete destruction (*yang dag par 'joms pa*) of the *kleśa*s.

448 MKHAN PO GZHAN DGA' did not include the equivalent to *yāvacchakyaṃ saṃpādanāt* in his commentary (*dge ba'i phyogs la brtsams na cung zad tsam gyis chog par mi 'dzin pas yid la gcags pa med pa'i phyir ro*, AS-gZhan 120a2), probably because *bsgrub nus pa'i bar du* is rather incomprehensible. It seems that he relied on the Tibetan translations exclusively. • AS-dPang-lo, fol. 248b3-4: "'There is no regret in his mind' [means] that [he] is without remorse for [something] he has not accomplished. Because with regard to the wholesome side [he] is accomplishing [it] for as long as he can, not being content with just a little." (*yid la gcags pa med pa ni dge ba'i phyogs la brtsams te ji srid nus pa sgrub pas cung zad tsam gyis mi ngoms pas na ma bsgrubs pas 'gyod pa med pa'i phyir te /*. It seems as if DPANG LO did not rely on the Tibetan translations exclusively, but rather consulted the Sanskrit text or another Tibetan commentary. • AS-Bu-ston, p. 559,7 adds: "He does not have regret (*yid bcags*), thinking 'I have not accomplished [this or that]'" (*ma bsgrubs so snyam pa'i yid bcags med*).

449 Canonical sources: MN III, no. 135, pp. 203, 206: *kammassakā māṇava sattā kammadāyādā kammayonī kammabandhū kammapaṭisaraṇā / kammaṃ satte vibhajati yad idaṃ hīppaṇītatāyā ti /*. RAHULA (*Compendium*, p. 97, n. 1) and PRADHAN (AS, p. 109) also have references to MN I, p. 390, which is related but different in phrasing. There are also parallels in the *Aṅguttaranikāya* (AN III, p. 72, etc.) which are similar only up to "*kammapaṭisaraṇo*". In the Chinese āgamas, there are parallels at MĀ 704c26f., etc. • YBh parallel: YBh 163,17. • Further references: *Xianyang shengjiao lun* 573c23-574c29 (自業等四種 ...), *Abhidharmadīpa* 183, **Mahāvibhāṣā* 649a17-20. The terms from *karmasvaka* to *karmapratisaraṇa* are contained in MaVyu, nos. 2313-2316. • Unfortunately, the fragments of the *Śukasūtra* described by HOERNLE (*Manuscript Remains*, pp. 46-52) do not contain the above-mentioned passage. • An equivalent to *kammabandhū* is missing in AS and MaVyu. • An equivalent to the vocative *māṇava* is missing in the AS. BU STON has nonetheless identified the sūtra text as starting with: *bram ze'i khye'u sogs te /*. See AS-Bu-ston, p. 559,7. • The passage has been translated, with some annotations, by MCDERMOTT, *Early Buddhist Concept of Kamma*, p. 2. LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (*Morale*, p. 202f.) uses the same quotation in the context of strict individual retribution, about which he has collected various Pāli and Sanskrit sources. • In SGAM PO PA's *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, *las bdag gir bya ba* (*karmasvaka*) and *las kyi bgo skal la spyod pa* (*karmadāyāda*) make up sections three and four respectively among the six sections of the explanation of *karman*. Both sections have quotations from the AS (or ASBh) as their core. See *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, pp. 54, 63f., GUENTHER, Jewel

Ornament, pp. 74, 81f. • That the principle of strict individual retribution taught here is somewhat at odds with concepts like *adhipatiphala* can also be seen in an (unidentified) quotation in the *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan* (p. 63): "Therefore [it is also said] in the sūtra: 'The *karman* done by Devadatta himself does not ripen in the earth or in the water [...]'" (*lha sbyin nyid kyis byas pa'i las ni / sa dang / chu la mi smin* [...]).

450 YBh parallel: *uccanīcatāyāṃ hīnapraṇītāyāṃ ca* (YBh 163,17).

451 The reconstruction is based on the $AS_{t,D}$ reading *rang gis byas pa'i las kyi rnam par smin pa* (AS_c reads 自造業而受異熟) and the respective ASBh phrase *svayaṃkṛtakarmavipāka* (ASBh 72,17). Nonetheless, the $AS_{t,P}$ reading *rang gis byas pa'i kyi rnam par smin pa* may be correct. In the next passage (AS 61,2-3), ASBh reads *svayaṃkṛtavipāka* (ASBh 72,19; cf. AS_c: 自業所得異熟, and $ASBh_{t,D}$ *rang gis byas pa'i las kyi rnam par smin pa*!). That is to say: °*karma*° in ASBh 72,17 may be an explicative element.

452 The word *gzhan* is illegible in $ASVy_{t,D}$, but it is clearly *gzhan* (and not *gzhan dag*) in the TBRC *par phud* edition.

453 GUENTHER (*Jewel Ornament*, p. 81) translates *gzhan dang thun mong ma yin pa* as: "Being dissimilar to others ...". • This phrase is quoted in SGAM PO PA's *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan* (*de ltar yang mngon pa kun las btus pa las /*, p. 63). GUENTHER (*Jewel Ornament*, p. 81) rightly refers to page 61 in PRADHAN's AS edition but leaves it unmentioned that the quotation is actually from the ASBh (or rather ASVy?). For the sake of comparison, I provide the three versions below:

Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan	*las bdag gir bya ba ji lta bu zhe na /*
$ASBh_{t,P}$	*[de dag gi] las bdag gir bya ba ji lta bu yin zhe na /*
$ASVy_{t,PD}$	*[de dag gi] las bdag gir bya ba ji lta bu zhe na /*

Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan	*rang gis byas pa'i las kyi rnam par smin pa myong ba'i phyir te /*
$ASBh_t$	*rang gis* ($ASBh_{t,D}$ *gis*; $ASBh_{t,P}$ *gi las*) *byas pa'i las kyi rnam par smin pa myong ba'i phyir te /*
$ASVy_t$	*rang gis byas pa'i las kyi rnam par smin pa myong ba'i phyir ro /*

Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan	*gzhan dag dang thun mong ma yin pa de* (Tib. *de* corrected from *da*) *ni bdag gi zhes pa'o // 1*
$ASBh_t$	*gang gzhan dag dang thun mong ma yin pa de ni bdag gi zhes bya'o //*

ASVy$_t$	*gang gzhan dang thun mong ma yin pa de ni bdag gi zhes brjod do //*

[454] For *saṃvibhajana*, ASBh$_t$ uses the equivalent *'ged*. MaVyu 2850 lists three equivalents for *saṃvibhajate*: *rnam par 'gyed pa*, *kun 'gyed*, and *kun 'ged*.

[455] This usage of *anyonya* resembles that of the classical Sanskrit term *anyonyavibhāga*, which according to MMW (s.v.) means "mutual partition (of an inheritance)". • AS$_c$, ASVy$_c$ 732b8 互違. No equivalent for *anyonya* in ASVy$_c$ 732b9-10 (隨善惡業力自所受異熟).

[456] *Karmayonīyāḥ* has been translated as "having karman as their place of birth" (*las kyi skye gnas pa*, AS$_t$). The metaphor is further weakened in the Chinese translation, "those who are born in accordance with/due to *karman*" (從業所生, AS$_c$), which is more to the point, but with a shorter detour in the metaphor probably has much less of an emotional impact (cf. DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 425, n. 144: "engendered", 所生). ▪ The sūtra passage is quite poetic and could be misinterpreted to the effect that beings are born due to nothing else but *karman*. ▪ The doctrine that thirst (*tṛṣṇā*) is the cause of *saṃsāra* of course has to be aligned with the *karman* doctrine. An attempt is made at AS 26,17, ASBh 33,5: From *karman* arise pleasant and unpleasant feelings, which are a cause of further thirst for feelings. See KRITZER, *Rebirth and Causation*, pp. 41f., 147. • Also MSg I.20 mentions various wrong views on causation, but those lists vary fundamentally from the current AS passage and from the AKBh. The Tibetan version mentions

- "origin from nature as a cause" (*rang bzhin gyi rgyu*)
- "miraculous creation by the Lord as a cause" (*dbang phyug gis sprul pa'i rgyu*)
- "self as a cause" (*bdag gi rgyu*)
- "simple absence of cause and conditions" (*rgyu med pa dang / rkyen med pa nyid*)

As stated above (ad AS 55,11), *karman* does not ultimately answer the question of the origin of the universe, but simply that of its perpetuation.

[457] "Nature" is certainly an unsatisfactory translation for this specific term. The Buddhist directs his criticism against a specific Sāṃkhya doctrine here. See HALBFASS, *Karma und Wiedergeburt*, pp. 149-154), and SCHMITHAUSEN, *Buddhism and Nature*, p. 55.

[458] ASVy$_c$ 732b13: "no cause or a bad cause" 無因惡因. In this context 惡 most likely means "bad" in the sense of "coarse, of inferior quality, foul" (as in 惡衣惡食, "bad clothing, bad food"). See TŌDŌ, MATSUMOTO, TAKEDA, eds., *Kanjigen*, s.v. 惡, point 2. But without knowledge of the Sanskrit original 惡 in the ASVy$_c$ can easily be mistaken as "bad", the opposite of "good" (善). See *ibid.* points 1 and 3. The latter meaning is probably overinterpreted by MATHEWS (*Chinese-English*, s.v. 惡): "evil, wicked, wrong, foul". In the AS$_c$ and ASVy$_c$ section under research, 惡 appears in expressions like 麁惡

語 (*pārusya*), 善惡趣 (*sugatidurgati*), and so on, none of which would necessitate a translation "evil". Furthermore, the opposite of 善 in the ethical sense is 不善 here.

459 In the ASVy$_t$, a part of the ASBh$_t$ explanation is placed before the AS$_t$ text: *de ltar 'jug pa las kyang brtsams ldog pa las kyang brtsams te / ji ltar na las brten par bya ba yin* ... (ASVy$_{t,P}$ 252b2). I assume that this is because the first phrase (*de ltar 'jug pa las kyang brtsams*) provides a link to the previous section in the AS (i.e. *karmayoni*, AS 61,3-4). • Same placement in the ASVy$_c$ 732b14-18: (ASBh:) 如是已說依業流轉。爲明歸滅亦依諸業。是故經言。依業出離。(AS:) 云何依業出離。依對治業解業縛故。(ASBh:) 謂依無漏業能斷有漏業故。唯依業而得出離. • MI PHAM's explanations seem somewhat jumbled: "[They are] relying on the place of birth (*skye gnas* = *yoni*) which is *karman* [in so far] as [they] rely on the *karman* that is the opponent (*gnyen po*) that liberates [them] from the fetter of *karman*" (*las kyi skye gnas la brten par bya ba ni / las kyis bcings pa las thar byed gnyen po'i las brtan par bya ba yin pas so* //, AS-Mi-pham, 464,6-465,1). If this is not a mistake on the part of MI PHAM, it should probably read *las kyi skye gnas pa / las brten par bya ba ni* or the like.

460 The words *brtan pa*, *rten pa*, *(b)stan pa* etc. are often confused in classical Tibetan texts. See e.g. AHN (*Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 103) where AHN suggests reading *brtan* against all editions he used (i.e. DP) which read *bstan*.

461 The last phrase in the ASVy$_c$ seems to be an addition by XUANZANG: "only depending on *karman* does one attain deliverance" (唯依業而得出離, ASVy$_c$ 732b17-18).

462 AS$_t$ "body" (*lus*); AS$_c$ "the own body" (自體).

463 Or, for *pratilabdātmabhāvāḥ* reconstruct *ātmabhāvapratilabdāḥ*? See BHSD, s.v. *ātmabhāva*.

464 As the AS exposition of *karman* is rather brief, so for the student many unanswered questions surely remain. Therefore it makes sense didactically to conclude with *acintya*. • The *locus classicus* for Pāli *acinteyya* (=Skt. *acintya*) in the sense of "that which one must not think about" is AN II, p. 80. KRITZER, "Unthinkable Matters", p. 65 (same passage mentioned in RAHULA, *Compendium*, p. 97, n. 2). *Kamma* is there classified as one of four things not to be thought about. In the translation of Thanissaro BHIKKHU (*Wings to Awakening*, p. 53): "These four imponderables are not to be speculated about. Whoever speculates about them would go mad & experience vexation. Which four? The Buddha-range of the Buddhas [i.e., the range of powers a Buddha develops as a result of becoming a Buddha]... The jhana-range of one absorbed in jhana [i.e., the range of powers that one may obtain while absorbed in jhana]... The results of kamma... Speculation about [the first moment, purpose, etc., of] the cosmos is an imponderable that is not to be speculated about. Whoever speculates about these things would go mad & experience vexation." Among the Chinese Āgamas, see e.g., T 125, 657a17-658a4 and 640a4-7 in the *Ekottarāgama* (KRITZER, op. cit., p. 79, n. 3) as well as SĀ 129a6 (T 99). • The AS addresses a controversial issue here, i.e. which aspects of *karman* have to be considered *acintya* (on this question, see KRITZER, "Unthinkable Matters", pp. 67f., 73f.),

but as usual there is no explicit refutation of divergent views. An example from the **Mahāvibhāṣā* for the controversies that were taking place: An unorthodox opinion ("有作是說") holds that the intermediate-state being (中有) enters the body of the mother (through the flesh) without obstruction (無礙). The reason why it then stays in the womb (依住此母胎中) is because it is held back by the power of *karma* (業力所拘故), and because a being's power of *karman* is unthinkable (有情業力不可思議). The **Mahāvibhāṣā* follows another interpretation (應作是說), i.e. that the intermediate-state being must necessarily enter through the vagina (入胎必從生門), because it is attracted to it (是所愛故). **Mahāvibhāṣā* 363c11-16, see KRITZER, "Unthinkable Matters", p. 67. I assume that the term *ai* (愛, "attraction"), the usual translation for Skt. *tṛṣṇā*, is an allusion to at least the formula of Origination in Dependence (or some version of it), if not *tṛṣṇā* as the root cause for *saṃsāra*. The **Mahāvibhāṣā* therefore defends a dogmatic approach, in so far as phenomena should be explained drawing on existing systematics, against an irrationalist one. Various arguments about the scope of *acintya*, also from the **Tattvasiddhi*, the AKBh, and so on, are presented in KRITZER ("Unthinkable Matters"). Regarding the discussion in the **Mahāvibhāṣā* above, it must also be noted that the role *karman* plays in conception (and the resulting physical constitution) was judged quite diversely in the Indian medical and philosophical literature. See HALBFASS, *Karma und Wiedergeburt*, pp. 227-232. The more fundamental question of whether rationalism or irrationalism came with the doctrine of *karman* is discussed *ibid.*, p. 241f. • In the Pāli commentarial tradition, the semantical range of *acintya* partially overlaps with that of the five *niyama*. *Karman* as a whole is considered a *niyama*, and also the "typical events occurring in the lives of the Buddhas". See NYANATILOKA, *Buddhist Dictionary*, s.v. *niyama*.

465 In the ASVy$_t$, the ASBh$_t$ text is exceptionally inserted within the AS passage (i.e. after *zhes gang gsungs pa de la*). The same arrangement is to be found in the ASVy$_c$ 732b20-22: (AS:) 如世尊說。有情業異熟不可思議。(ASBh:) 如是經意非一切種皆不可思議。(AS:) 云何業異熟不可思議。云何可思議.

466 The AS$_{t,P}$ editors have missed the point and added *mi* to all occurrences of *bsam kyis khyab pa*. See also below (ASBh 71,21-22), where a whole phrase (*bsam gyis khyab pa ni ji lta bu*)has been omitted in ASBh$_t$ for the same reason. • Also MI PHAM wrongly describes the pleasant results of wholesome actions (and the unpleasant results of unwholesome actions) as unthinkable. He makes no mention of any thinkable aspects of *karman* (AS-Mi-pham, 465,2-3: *las kyi rnam par smin pa bsam gyis mi khyab par gsungs pa ni / dge bas lha mi rnams kyi 'dod pa bsam gyis mi khyab / de bzhin mi dges dmyal ba yi dags dud 'gror mi 'dod pa bsam gyis mi khyab / dod pa bsam gyis mi khyab*). This could well be a scribal error since MI PHAM assumedly relied on the sDe-dge edition of the AS. • ŚĀKYA MCHOG LDAN has correctly seen the distinction that is to be made here: "There are two: those thinkable, and those unthinkable" (*de la gnyis te / bsam gyis khyab pa dang mi khyab pa'o*, AS-Śāk, p. 216,6-7). • In ASVy$_c$ 732b21-22 the order of *cintya* and *acintya* is reversed: 云何業異熟不可思議。云何可思議.

[467] On the omission of the phrase *bsam gyis khyab pa ni ji lta bu* in ASBh$_{t}$, see my notes above (ad AS 61,8).

[468] The reconstruction in the singular follows the AS$_{t,D}$ reading *las dge ba'i* against the plural in AS$_{t,P}$ *dge ba rnams kyi* and AS$_{c}$ 諸善業於 (same in ASVy$_{c}$). The singular is supported by ASVy$_{t,PD}$. The value of the Chinese reading is also called into question in the next AS sentence, where the singular in AS$_{t,PD}$ (*mi dge ba'i las kyi*) stands against the plural in AS$_{c}$ and ASVy$_{c}$ 諸不善業. Also, in the respective ASBh explanations *kuśalākuśalasya* clearly stands in the singular. I do not think that the plural in AS$_{t,P}$ and AS$_{c}$ is to be preferred as the more difficult reading ("*difficilior lectio potior*") but I rather assume that *karmaṇo* was misread as *karmaṇām* at some point in the transmission.

[469] The translation of AS$_{t}$ is rather obscure. It could be misunderstood as: "Claiming that the ripening of wholesome *karman* [takes place] among gods and humans is (Peking: "un-") thinkable."

[470] In the ASVy$_{t}$, the explanations of AS 61,11-12 (that should actually precede ASBh 73,2-4) have wrongly been inserted here: *las 'dis sems can rnams kyi lus sna tshogs su 'gyur zhes bya ba 'di ni bsam gyis mi khyab pa'o // dge ba dang mi dge ba'i rnam par smin pa* ... ASVy$_{t,P}$ 252b7, ASVy$_{t,D}$ 210a2.

[471] It seems to me that the ASBh$_{t}$ translators did not comprehend the meaning of the expression of term *śakyatvāt*, which they translated as *nus pa dang* [...]. That unclear translation was not improved in the ASVy$_{t}$, which speaks against a thorough revision with reference to the Sanskrit MS. XUANZANG, in contrast, added a further explanation to *śakyatvāt*, saying "Because [even] those with worldly intellect comprehend it" (see also the expression *lokacintā* at ASBh 73,8, and my discussion of the Theravāda concept of *upatthambhakakamma* ad AS 54,11-12), and placed the text in the correct order (諸不善業墮三惡趣得不愛異熟。是可思議。由善惡業往善惡趣。感得可愛不可愛異熟。世間智者能思議故。由此能引發正見等功德故。即由此業感諸有情自身異熟等種種差別不可思議, ASVy$_{c}$ 732b23-27). The incorrect order of the ASVy$_{t}$ makes it probable that not the original compilers of the text, having a Sanskrit MS at hand, put that sentence in a wrong position, but a later revisor. I suspect that it was difficult to make sense of the expression *nus pa dang*, and that it was therefore wrongly associated with *lus* and thus inserted at the wrong place.

[472] ASBh$_{t,P}$ irregularly contains the element "the distinguished virtues, such as ..." (*la sogs pa'i yon tan khyad par can*), which is has no equivalent in the ASBh MS. In contrast, ASVy$_{c}$ 732b26 is completely regular: 正見等功德.

[473] The section AS 61,11-13 and its ASBh commentary are summarized in KRITZER, "Unthinkable Matters", p. 74 and p. 84, n. 50.

[474] In how far the composition of a sentient being's body due to *karman* is unthinkable is discussed in the **Tattvasiddhi* (see KRITZER, "Unthinkable Matters", p. 67f.). • Shape as separate from colour is considered only a mental construct in the AKBh and the *Karmasiddhi*. See AKBh 195,8, STCHERBATSKY, *Central Conception*, p. 11,

Karmasiddhi, pp. 1-5, LAMOTTE, "Traité de l'acte", pp. 164, 208-212. Such a distinction is unknown from the AS, so its usage of the term shape (*saṃsthāna*, more literally "arrangement" or "formation") is rather commonsensical. • $ASVy_c$ 732b28: 形色.

475 The same list can be found in $VinSg_{t,D}$ *zi* 190b8-191a1: *de la sems can rnams kyi rnam par smin pa la sems pa ni rnam pa bzhis bsam gyis mi khyab pa yin te / gnas dang dngos po dang / rgyu dang rnam par smin pa las so //.* See KRITZER, "Unthinkable Matters", p. 74, n. 49. Like the AS, the VinSg contains the list only, with no further explanations.

476 The Tibetan text of $ASBh_{t,P}$ differs significantly from ASBh: *dge ba la sogs pa'i las de nyid gnas la sogs pa'i rab tu dbye bas ni bsam gyis mi khyab po //* (see below). • $ASVy_c$ 732c2-3 differs in other points: Because the differentiations of precisely this *karman* [in terms of] place and so on are limitless [and therefore] incomprehensible, ..." (由即此業處差別等無量無邊難可思議故). This means (most probably) that the places where *karman* can be performed are beyond count and therefore beyond comprehension. The same applies for objects and so on.

477 KRITZER, "Unthinkable Matters", p. 84, n. 50: "*sthāna* refers to the place in which an action was performed." • As TATIA has already noted, a scribal error has occurred, due to which a long part of the text is supplied in the lower margin.

478 $ASVy_c$ 732c4: 或於城邑或於村落.

479 KRITZER, "Unthinkable Matters", p. 84, n. 50: "*vastu* refers to whether or not the action pertains to living beings."

480 On the three "roots of unwholesome [*karman*]", greed (*lobha*), hatred (*dveṣa*), and delusion (*moha*), see above, ASBh 63,17-18.

481 KRITZER, "Unthinkable Matters", p. 84, n. 50: "*hetu* refers to the *kuśalamūlas* or *akuśalamūlas*."

482 As TATIA has already observed, this compound is not found in $ASBh_t$ and $ASVy_c$ (善不善根). It is also missing in the $ASVy_t$.

483 KRITZER, "Unthinkable Matters", p. 84, n. 50: "*vipāka* refers to the variety of *ātmabhāvas*."

484 In $ASBh_t$, a Tibetan equivalent for *bāhyabhāva* is missing. I have no explanation for this. AS_t and $ASVy_t$ have *phyi'i dngos po.*

485 $ASBh_{t,P}$ *'jig rten gyi bsam par ma gtogs pa'i phyir ro*; $ASVy_{t,D}$ 210a6: *'jig rten gyi khams pas mi rtogs pa'i phyir ro.* In this case $ASBh_t$ is much more accurate, while the grave mistakes in $ASVy_t$ (*khams* for *bsam* and *gtogs* for *rtogs*) were quite certainly produced by later Tibetan editors without reference to a Skt. MS.

486 We now temporarily leave the domain of *karman* in the sense of moral retribution. Plants, crystals, and so on, are not living beings (see SCHMITHAUSEN, *Sentience of Plants*, p. 2) and do not accumulate *karman* for future ripening (*ibid.*, p. 96). The powers of

plants, etc. described here were probably considered their *kāritrakarman* (on which see above, ASBh 63,7-8).

487 The word *karman* as such can mean "medical treatment". See BÖHTLINGK and ROTH, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung* (s.v. *karman*): "ärztliche Behandlung, Cur".

488 In a more general sense, *oṣadhi*, can also mean "herbs", but as this passage deals with wondrous powers, it quite clearly refers to medicine, or at least medical herbs. • In AS_c and $ASVy_c$ 732c11, the order of *mantra* and *oṣadhi* is changed: 藥草呪. Also changed is the order of explanation in $ASVy_c$ 732c12-15. Possibly an editor of the Chinese text thought he was dealing with three compound words: "*ma ni* jewels" (末尼珠), "medicine" (藥草), and "the skill/art of *mantras*" (呪術)?

489 In $ASVy_c$ 732c12-15, the order of *mantra* and *auṣadhi* is changed. See note on AS 61,14, above.

490 $ASVy_t$ *zla ba chu shel*; $ASBh_t$ *chu shel*. $ASVy_t$ could either be a later improvement of the earlier, less literal $ASBh_t$ rendering. Or it could be based on a different MS, which would equal our $ASBh_{MS}$. Cf. $ASVy_c$ 732c12: 月愛珠. • Cf. AS-Bu-ston, p. 561,1: "From a fire jewel [comes fire], from a water jewel comes water ..." (*me shel las me / chu shel las chu 'byung ...*).

491 $ASVy_c$ 732c12 seems to translate *kṣaraṇa* actively: "the moon-loving jewel and so on emit water" (月愛珠等能出水). Cf. $ASBh_t$: "from the side of the water jewel (/crystal) and so on, water comes forth" (*chu shel la sogs pa las chu 'byung ba*).

492 The myth of water coming forth seems to be bases on the bluish shine visible on a polished moon stone.

493 $ASVy_c$ 732c14: "[when one] recites that *mantra*, then" (誦此呪便); $ASBh_t$ "when [it] is struck by those" (*de dag gis btab na*).

494 Cf. $ASVy_c$ 732c13: "by holding this drug one hides one's body, etc." (執持此藥藏隱形等).

495 On the term *muṣṭiyoga* (MaVyu 7622), see BÖHTLINGK and ROTH, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung*, s.v.: "Darreichung einer Handvoll, - in kleinen Quantitäten." • AS_c and $ASVy_c$ 732c11 use the equivalent "skill, art" (術).

496 $ASVy_c$ 732c14: "one heals fever" (治熱病). The healing of fever is also a special power of the "moon-loving jewel" (月愛珠). See NAKAMURA, et al., *Iwanami bukkyōjiten*, s.v. 月光摩尼. The translation "fever" is only an approximate one: 101 diseases (all caused by the element "fire") are grouped under 熱病 ("fever", or rather "hot diseases"?). See Taijun INOKUCHI's entry 四百四病 in the *Sekaidaihyakkajiten*. • $ASBh_t$ has "one is freed from infectious diseases" (*rims nad dang bral bar 'gyur ba*), not "fever". Also in the YBh-Index-CST, *rims nad* (and not *tsha nad*) appears as the equivalent of *jvara* and 熱

病.

[497] ASBh$_t$ reads *rnal 'byor pa thams cad*, as if translating * *sarvayoginām*. I assume thams cad here is a free rendering of the plural.

[498] Cf. *Bodhisattvabhūmi* 40,17ff. where *kampana* appears as the first member of a longer list of miraculous powers (*kampana*, *Bodhisattvabhūmi* 41,3; *jvalana*, *Bodhisattvabhūmi* 41,9; *spharaṇa*, *Bodhisattvabhūmi* 41,14; etc.).

[499] The term "wide earth" (*mahāpṛthivī*, Tib. *sa chen po*) means the earth upon which mount Meru, the great ocean, and the four continents rest. It appears in the context of cosmogony at ASBh 35,5f. (see also AK III.90, AKBh 179,15f).

[500] The miracles of flying through the sky and the wide earth shaking are also mentioned in the *Milindapañha*. The wide earth shakes, it is explained, in cases when a virtuous act is too great for the earth deity to bear. See RHYS DAVIDS, trans., *Questions of King Milinda: Part I*, p. 173: "It is at no common effort, O king, at no ordinary struggle, that the great earth is moved. It is when overborne by the weight of righteousness, overpowered by the burden of the goodness of acts which testify of absolute purity, that, unable to support it, the broad earth quakes and trembles and is moved."

[501] Note that the Bodhisattva here appears a quasi-mythical being, not directly as a model for a Buddhists ethics. Only in a figurative sense are such virtues as aiming at a long life, self control, etc. expounded to the reader. • The attainment of the Ten Kinds of Control is said to bring about comprehension of what is unthinkable (*acintya*) in the *Daśabhūmikasūtra*, p. 70. HONDA, "*Daśabhūmika-Sūtra*", p. 228 (section P of the eighth *bhūmi*): "He, with the acquisition of these ten masteries of Bodhisattva, becomes the knower of inconceivability, incomparability [...]." • In the MSg, Asaṅga puts much emphasis on the Ten Kinds of Control (FRAUWALLNER: "Machtvollkommenheiten") in his explanation of the Buddha. See FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, pp. 332f., 346, and 347. MSg X.03.2., for example, explains the Ten Kinds of Control as the results of the Six Perfections. On the Ten Kinds of Control at MSg X.3.2 and commentaries, see also GRIFFTHS, et al., *Realm of Awakening*, pp. 77-81, 283-285. GRIFFTHS, et al. (op. cit., p. 76, n. 27) also refer to the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, p. 240, and to the VinSg$_{t,D}$ *zi*, fol. 29a5. On *vaśitā* in the YBh, see also SAKUMA, *Āśrayaparivṛtti*, vol. 1, pp. 102-104. • Naoya FUNAHASHI ("Shijizai to jūjizai") has compared the tenfold lists of the *Daśabhūmikasūtra*, AS, MSg and *Xianyang shengjiao lun* on the one hand with the fourfold lists of the *Madhyāntavibhāga* and the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* on the other hand. He proposes that the tenfold lists predate the fourfold ones of the Maitreya texts (*ibid.*, p. 366). For varying lists of the Ten Kinds of Control, see also MOCHIZUKI (*Bukkyō daijiten*, s.v. *jizai*) and *Mahāvyutpatti* 770-780. Although the explanations of the ASBh vary greatly from those of the MSg commentaries and even more from the *Daśabhūmikasūtra*, a detailed comparison would be beyond the scope of this study. • According to the DPANG LO, the Ten Kinds of Control are exerted by the Bodhisattvas from the eighth level onwards (*byang chub sems dpa' sa brgyad pa yan chad kyi dbang 'byor pa'i las te* [...], AS-dPang-lo, fol. 249b5; s.a. AS-Bo-dong-bShad, p. 632,6: *sa [b]rgyad pa ba yan chad rnams kyi dbang gi las bsam gyis mi khyab* [...]). This doctrine can be traced in the

eighth *bhūmi* (section O) of the *Daśabhāmikasūtra*, p. 70.

[502] In the ASVy$_{t}$, this sentence is placed after the list of the Ten Powers. The ASVy$_{t}$ is thus in accordance with the ASVy$_{c}$ (and, subsequently, the AS$_{c}$). I therefore assume that that is the original order of the ASVy. Nonetheless, I think this sentence belongs before the AS list of Ten Powers as the ASBh clearly explains the introductory sentence of the AS, using every word as a *pratīka*, also using the word *tadyathā*, which most probably stood before the list in the AS. The terms from the AS list appear as *pratīka*s only after that in the ASBh.

[503] ASBh$_{t,P}$ seems to read **vaśitādibhir* (*dbang la sogs pas*). ASVy$_{t}$ only reproduces AS$_{t}$ and makes no mention of *gang byed pa* or the like.

[504] The terminology used by XUANZANG at *Xianyang shengjiao lun* 517b16-18 differs from the AS$_{c}$ in three points:

AS	AS$_{c}$	*Xianyang shengjiao lun*
āyurvaśita	命自在	壽自在
pariṣkāravaśita	財自在	眾具自在
ṛddhivaśita	神通自在	神變自在

[505] On the placement of this sentence in the ASVy, see above, ad ASBh 73,14.

[506] SGAM PO PA quotes the AS without an equivalent to the phrase *āyuḥsaṃskārān adhiṣṭhāya* in his *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan* (p. 21): *de la tshe la dbang ba ni / ji srid 'dod pa de srid du gnas par nus so //*. • ASVy$_{c}$ 732c22 reads "he holds the *saṃskāra*s of life and remains as long as he pleases" (持諸壽行・隨所欲樂爾所時住).

[507] Cf. GRIFFITHS, et al., *Realm of Awakening*, p. 148: "What is the purification of mind? It is ... accomplishment in mastering entry into concentration at will" (*thugs yongs su dag pa gang zhe na / ji ltar bzhed pa bzhin du ting nge 'dzin gyi sgo la* ‹for *sgo la*, GRIFFITHS et al., *op.cit.*, p. 318, read *sgol*› *dbang sgyur ba*, AS$_{t,P}$ 342b2).

[508] ASBh$_{t}$: *snyoms par' jug go*: cf. *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 22 *mnyam par 'jog nus pa'o*. GUENTHER, *Jewel Ornament*, p. 33: " [...] to be able to enter a state of meditative absorption [...]". • ASVy$_{c}$ 732c23 "entering and leaving *samādhi*" (三摩地入出).

[509] ASBh$_{t}$ (= *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 22): "just as they wish" (*ji ltar 'dod pa bzhin du*); dto. ASVy$_{c}$ 732c23: 隨其所樂. • ASVy$_{t}$ "for as long as they wish" (*ji srid 'dod pa bzhin du*).

[510] The explanations of *pariṣkāravaśita*, *karmavaśita*, as well as *upapattivaśita* are missing in ASVy$_{c}$ 732c23. • In ASBh$_{MS}$ 66b1, the scribe left out one definition and one definiendum, supplying the definition of *karmavaśitā* instead of that for *pariṣkāravaśita*. He possibly mistook °*kāravaśitayā* for *karmavaśitayā* while copying (cf. above, ASBh 73,4-5). The missing words (*aprameyam anargheyam upakaraṇavarṣaṃ sattvānāṃ*

varṣanti / karmavaśitayā) are supplied in the lower margin. I do not assume a causal connection between this omission of the ASBh_{MS} and that of the ASVy_{c} (see above). • DPANG LO adds a discussion about how poverty results from *karman*. Indeed, a Bodhisattva's benefit for beings is systematically questionable. If the happiness that arises from a Bodhisattva's deeds is karmically deserved in any case, what is the point in the Bodhisattva helping them? If otherwise suffering is deserved through bad deeds, would it not be unjust (or even impossible) to ward off that evil? DPANG LO does not make this fundamental point explicit here. He refers to the MSg: *las dang sgrib pa mngon gyur dang // gsog dang gnod byed mthong ba'i phyir // byang chub sems dpa' rnams las ni // sems can longs spyod mi 'thob brjod //*, AS-dPang-lo, fol. 249b6-250a2.

511 ASBh_{t} *sems can thams cad la*; cf. ASVy_{t}, *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 22: *sems can rnams la. sarva* The phrase *sarvasattva* often appears in the context of the Bodhisattvas beneficent activity (see, e.g. ASBh 73,24), but here *sems can thams cad* seems to be a mistake on the part of the translators. It seems that the plural and expressions for "all" frequently overlap. Also the Chinese particle 諸 ("various", see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 512, n. 141) is sometimes used to render the plural, sometimes a pars pro toto singular (*ibid.*, p. 412, n. 8 and p. 475, n. 22), while 諸... 等 can stand for Skt. *sarva* (*ibid.*, p. 437, n. 288).

512 Two Sanskrit terms, *pariṣkāra* and *upakaraṇa* have been translated as *yo byad* in this phrase. Cf. *Mahāyānasaṃgrahopanibandhana* (Tibetan version) §B2a: *yo byad ni 'tshog chas* (D *'tshog chas*; P *tshogs chas*) *zhes bya ba dang don gcig*. GRIFFITHS, et al., *Realm of Awakening*, p. 78: "The term 'necessities' is synonymous with requisites."

513 The *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 22 reads with $\text{ASVy}_{\text{t,P}}$: *yo byad rin po che dpag tu med pa*, against $\text{ASBh}_{\text{t,P}}$ *yo byad rin po che dang dpag tu med pa*. GUENTHER's translation (*Jewel Ornament*, p. 33) as "immeasurably valuable necessities" is, nonetheless, not completely accurate.

514 Cf. AS-Bo-dong-bShad, p. 633,1-2: *yo byad kyis char 'bebs pa*. The instrumental *-s* is quite certainly a scribal error.

515 In the MSg and its commentaries, *karmavaśitā* primarily means control of the Bodhisattvas over their own deeds. Based on such an interpretation, the *Mahāyanasaṃgrahabhāsya* states "Since actions are the cause [for birth], and birth is the result, they are interrelated". GRIFFITHS, et al., *Realm of Awakening*, p. 78f. *Mahāyanasaṃgrahabhāsya* (PARAMĀRTHA's translation) 251a2: 業爲因生爲果故。此二相應. • It should be noticed that the Bodhisattva's control over *karman* is, although unthinkable, nonetheless limited. The Bodhisattva cannot eradicate or create *karman* for someone, but only manipulate the conditions of its ripening. Therefore the principle that "beings have *karman* as their own" (*karmasvaka*, see AS 60,23-61,1) remains intact. Cf. GUENTHER, *Jewel Ornament*, p. 33: "to be able to improve the effect of Karma" (*Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 22: *gzhan du sbyor nus pa*).

516 "Plane" (*bhūmi*) has to be understood in the sense of the nine planes as taught at AKBh 85,15: *nava bhūmayaḥ / kāmadhātur aṣṭau ca dhyānārūpyāḥ*. Cf. GUENTHER,

Jewel Ornament, p. 33: "continent".

[517] Cf. GUENTHER, *Jewel Ornament*, p. 33: "place in life". He seems to understand *avasthā* (Tib. *gnas skabs*) in the sense the four states of human life (childhood, youth, adulthood, old age), Skt. *avasthācatuṣṭaya*.

[518] DPANG LO does not mention absorption or the realm of desire, but says: "Through control over birth [the Bodhisattva] takes birth as [he] wishes." (*skye ba la dbang bas gang 'dod par skye'o//*, AS-dPang-lo, fol. 250a3). • The *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan* has an additional phrase: "And, although he has taken birth there, he is not tainted by its faults." *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 22: *skye ba la dbang ba ni / bsam gtan la gnas shing yongs su ma nyams bzhin du / 'dod pa'i khams su skye bar nus la / der skyes nas kyang de'i nyes pas mi gos pa'o //*. A similar explanation is found in the *Mahāyānasaṃgrahabhāsya*, but it should be noted that this sentence actually comments upon *cittavaśita* and not *upapattivaśita*: "'the second is mastery over mind,' for although he is born into transmigration, he does not have the impurities of transmigration." GRIFFITHS, et al., *Realm of Awakening*, p. 78 (translated from PARAMĀRTHA's Chinese version T 1959, 250c23-24: 論曰。二心自在。釋曰。於生死受生。不爲生死染污). Similarly *Mahāyānasaṃgrahopanibandhana*: *sems la dbang ba ni gang 'khor ba* ‹P: *na*› *kun nas nyon mongs pa med pa dang [...]*.GRIFFITHS, et al., op. cit., p. 283f. A connection between an undefiled life in the worldly realms and *praṇidhāna* is mentioned in the *Daśabhūmikasūtra*: *traidhātukopapattiṃ ca praṇidhānavaśenābhinirharati satvaparipācanārthaṃ na ca lokadoṣair lipyate śāntapraśāntopaśāntaś ca bhavati.* RAHDER, "Seventh Stage", p. 227 (RAHDER translates: "by means of praṇidhānabalam he accepts birth in the three-world, but is not defiled by the three-world" [sic]. art. cit., p. 247). Although the context of this *Daśabhūmikasūtra* passage is not the Ten Kinds of Control, it nonetheless suggests that undefiled birth was traced back to various kinds of supernatural power rather arbitrarily in different sources. • Whether or not a Buddha has non-concentrated thoughts was discussed among the Ābhidharmikas. According to the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, he is always in the attainment (*mnyam par bzhag pa, *samāhita*) of concetration. See KRITZER, "Unthinkable Matters", p. 70.

[519] This kind of power is taught in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (WOGIHARA, ed., p. 60,5-9), with the same emphasis on aspiration, saying that the Bodhisattvas can transform earth into water if they aspire (*adhimucyate*) to do so. In the ŚrBh, a similar ability is taught in the context of the miraculous power one gains through the mundane path. See DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 462 and p. 575, n. 271. • DPANG LO makes it explicit that the Bodhisattvas can transform water, and so on, into anything they like (*mos pa la dbang bas sa dang chu sogs gang mos par sgyur ro //*, AS-dPang-lo, fol. 250a3). A similar clarification is contained in the *Thar pa rin po che rgyan* (p. 22): *chu la sogs par mos na'ang bsgyur nus pa*. • That ability to transform any material into any other material seems to be implied in the example presented in the *Mahāyānasaṃgrahopanibandhana* (Tibetan version) §B2a: "they transform earth, and so on, into gold, and so on" (*sa la sogs pa gser la sogs par bsgyur*). See GRIFFITHS, et al., *Realm of Awakening*, p. 80.

[520] On the term *adhimukti*, see also above, AS 60,19-20. • In the context of this ASBh

explanation (*adhimukti* ... *adhimucyante*), the interpretation of *adhi-/muc*, as "to make a (magical) act of volition", or "changes (something, acc.) by magic into (something else, acc.)" (BHSD, s.v. *adhi-/muc*) applies. The BHSD refers to the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (WOGIHARA ed., p. 60,5): *pṛthīvim apo 'dhimucyate*. Cf. SWTF (s.v. *adhi-/muc*): "durch konzentrierte Willenskraft hervorbringen". See also SCHMITHAUSEN, "Sanskrit-Wörterbuch", p. 409. • GRIFFITHS, et al. (*Realm of Awakening*, p. 79f.) translate *adhimuktivaśita* (or, its Tibetan and Chinese equivalents) as "mastery over commitment" and "mastery over aspiration" with reference to SCHMITHAUSEN, "Sanskrit-Wörterbuch". • GUENTHER (*Jewel Ornament*, p. 33) uses the term "creative imagination", with reference to *Daśabhūmikasūtra*, p. 70. Nonetheless, as far as I see, the occurrence of *adhimukti* in the *Daśabhūmikasūtra* does not substantiate the equivalent "creative imagination".

521 According to the *Daśabhūmikasūtra*, the Bodhisattva on the first level (*bhūmi*) makes ten Great Resolutions. See DUTT, *Mahāyāna Buddhism*, p. 107f. The term is also used in other contexts, e.g. in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*. See DUTT, op. cit., p. 107, n. 1. and NAKAMURA, et al., *Iwanami bukkyōjiten*, s.v. 大願.

522 Cf. *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 22: *smon lam 'debs shing / de mngon par 'grub pa'o //*. Cf. also GUENTHER, *Jewel Ornament*, p. 33f.: "'Power over resolution' means to be able to determine to fulfil one's own and other's interests perfectly and also to accomplish this resolution." • $ASVy_c$ 732c25: 能引.

523 $ASBh_t$, $ASVy_t$: *kun tu ston to*. Cf. *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 22: *ston nus pa'o*.

524 $ASBh_t$ as well as the $ASVy_{t,P}$ render *sattvānām āvarjanārtham* as *sems can rnams 'dun par bya ba'i phyir*. To the same effect, *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 22: *sems can 'dun par bya ba'i phyir* (GUENTHER, *Jewel Ornament*, p. 34: "in order to instil yearning into sentient beings"), and $ASVy_c$ 732c26: 爲欲攝化無量有情). The phrasing of AS-dPang-lo (fol. 250a4) differs slightly: *sems can 'dun pa'i ched du*. Cf. $ASVy_{t,D}$ *sems can rnams gdul bar bya ba'i phyir*.

525 The vowel length above *prā* in the ASBh MS is rather faint. The emendation to *prātihāryaṃ* is supported by YBh-Index-CST, s.v. 示現種種神通.

526 $ASBh_t$, $ASVy_t$: *rnams kyi rab kyi mthar phyin par 'gro'o*. The reading of *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 22, is rather jumbled: *rnams rab ni mthar phyin par mkhyen pa'o*.

527 DPANG LO (AS-dPang-lo, fol. 250a4) has observed that what the ASBh lists here are the Four Discriminating Knowledges (*pratisaṃvid*), on which see AS 66,19 (reconstruction), ASBh 128,8ff., RAHULA, *Compendium*, p. 166, NAKAMURA, "Erwachen", p. 52f., n. 17 and p. 61f., DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, pp. 566-568, n. 257, LAMOTTE, *Grande vertu de sagesse*, vol. 3, pp. 1614ff., DAYAL, *Bodhisattva Doctrine*, pp. 259-267, and especially FURUSAKA, "Shimugege", pp. 134-136. See also NYANATILOKA, *Buddhist Dictionary*, s.v. *paṭisaṃbhidā*. CONZE (*Buddhist Thought in India*, p. 172) counts *pratisaṃvid* among the words that "are not amendable to satisfactory grammatical analysis", which is, I think, confirmed by DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 566, n. 257. • See also AS-Bo-dong-bShad, p. 633,4: *so sor rig pa bzhi'i mi bde*

ba (?) *phul du byung ba la dbang ba.* • The ASBh here seems to contradict the teachings of the *Daśabhūmikasūtra* (p. 76, ninth *bhūmi*, section L, see also DAYAL, *Bodhisattva Doctrine*, p. 262), according to which the four discriminating knowledges are attained on the ninth Bodhisattva level while the Ten Kinds of Control are already realized on the eight level (*ibid.*, p. 140). • The definition of control over the *Dharma* (the tenth kind of control) is hard to distinguish from that of the four discriminating knowledges. Still, DELEANU (*Mundane Path*, p. 566f., n. 257) has convincingly shown that the term *dharma* in *dharmapratisaṃvid* does not necessarily mean the Buddhist doctrine (cf. GUENTHER, *Jewel Ornament*, p. 34: "fully to know the Dharma"). AKVy 652,14 ("here the teaching is meant by *dharma*", *iha deśanā dharmaḥ*) can be understood in that way, but *deśanā* here seems to mean act of teaching, or even the eloquence needed for that. • The *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra* (XVIII.19ff.) contains a longer description of those two kinds of knowledge: *Dharma* here means knowing exactly all the names for all factors (Tib. *chos*), for their nature and their divisions (*bye brag*), every letter (*yig 'bru*) of those names, and so on, while *artha* means knowing how many factors (*chos*) there are, how they exist (*ji snyed*), and so on. I wonder whether by that definition, the former (*dharma*) must not necessarily imply the latter (*artha*) and vice versa, but what basically seems to meant here is that one is omniscient and has the lingual capacities to pass one's knowledge on to others. The twofold distinction probably sets an ideal for Buddhist education rather than aiming at absolute consistency. • The terms *dharma* and *artha* (or, *dhamma* and *attha* in Pāli) appear to be synonymous in other contexts, for example at AN II, p. 97, where both refer to Buddhist doctrine. See SCHMITHAUSEN, "Benefiting", p. 151, n. 12.

[528] AS-dPang-lo, fol. 250a5: "Through control over the Dharma he can satisfy beings, from one up to all, simultaneously by teaching them the sūtras, and so on by means of different words, phrases, and syllables." (*chos la dbang bas sems can gcig nas kun gyi bar la ming tshig yi ge tha dad pa rnams kyis mdo sde sogs bshad pas cig car tshim par byed nus pa'o //*). • *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 22: *cig car gsung gcig gis so so'i skad dang mthun par sems yongs su tshim par byed nus pa'o //*. GUENTHER, *Jewel Ornament*, p. 34: "to be able fully to satisfy the minds of all sentient beings by a single discourse on the Dharma in their respective languages".

[529] ASVy$_c$ 733a1 takes *yāvat sarvasattvānam* together : 乃至一切有情.

[530] "Establish" is here to be understood in the sense of "explanation and definition".

[531] "Sūtra and so on" seems to refer to "twelve branches of proclamation of the Dharma" (*dvādaśāṅgadharmapravacanam*, MaVyu 1266-1278, see also AS 78,2-4), the first of which is *sūtra* (*mdo'i sde*, MaVyu 1267). AS-dPang-lo (fol. 250a5) renders *sūtra* as "*mdo sde [sogs]*", cf. ASBh$_t$: *mdo la sogs pa'i chos...*, *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*, p. 22: *mdo la sogs pa'i chos rnam par bzhag nas*. GUENTHER (*Jewel Ornament*, p. 34: "expounding it as in the Sūtras and other works". • The *Bodhisattvabhūmi* explains that a Tathāgata (!) can "teach the Śrāvakas in various ways which [...] were expounded in the ŚrBh" (see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 185). The ASBh here abstains from referring to any part of the YBh or an explicit distinction between Śrāvakas and Mahāyānists.

[532] On the term *anyonya*, see also the notes corresponding to AS 55,13-16.

[533] On *nāmapadavyaṃjana*, see, e.g., COX, *Disputed Dharmas*, pp. 159-171.

[534] Cf. MSg II.33: *sangs rgyas kyi mdzad pa lhun gyis grub pa rgyun mi gcod par gnas pa*. LAMOTTE (*Somme*, vol. 2, p. 135) translates this as "conserver sans interruption l'activitée spontanée du Buddha." According to LAMOTTE (*op.cit.*, p. 137), this phase is explicative of *buddhavihāreṇa viharan*. The metaphor is thus "dwelling, remaining" (*gnas pa*, **sthiti*) which is analogous to *gatiṃgataḥ* (on which see below) in so far as something which is actually a mental state is expressed in terms of spatial movement or location. On *buddhakṛtya*, see also MSg X.29: *sangs rgyas kyi mdzad pa thams cad lhun gyis grub par rgyun mi gcod pa'i phyir / de bzhin gshegs pa rnams lhun gyis grub pa'o zhes bya ba*. "'Les Tahāgata n'ont pas d'effort à faire (*anābhoga*)', car, exempte d'effort (*anābhoga*) toute l'activité du Buddha (*sarvabuddhakriyā*) ne connaît pas d'interruption (*asamucchinna*)." LAMOTTE (*Somme*, vol. 2, p. 215f.). See also MSg VIII.17, which I have already mentioned above (ASBh 74,1-3), LÉVI, *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*, ch. IX, verses 18 and 19, and NAKAMURA, "Erwachen", p. 90, n. 7.

[535] The reading *gtogs par* of ASBh$_{t,PNGDC}$ against *rtogs par* of ASVy$_{t,PNGDC}$ is remarkable and thus worth discussing in some detail. The equivalent *gtogs pa* (lit. "reached", but also "belonging to") for *gata* (lit. "gone") reasonably appears, e.g., in YBh-Index-CST and NEGI, *Tibetan-Sanskrit*, s.v. *gtogs pa*. NEGI lists *gtogs pa* as an equivalent for Skt. *-gaḥ* at *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* 3.3 (as in G 3183, fol. *ka*, 8a4 and BDE RDZOGS SMIN, ed., *mNgon rtogs rgyan*, p. 39), but notes that also *rtogs pa* appears (as in D 3786, fol. *ka* 6a5). *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* 3.3 is quoted, with the spelling *gtogs*, at D 3793, fol. *ja* 102a2. It seems to me that *rtogs* and *gtogs* are related semantically: *rTogs pa* is used, e.g., for *ava-/gam* where it means "under-stand", and the standard equivalent of *abhisamaya* (based on the verb */i*, "to go") is *mngon par rtogs pa*. ▪ At MaVyu 866 and 2888, *gatiṃgataḥ* is translated as *rtogs pa khong du chud pa*, ("having internalized the [correct] understanding"), at MaVyu 356 as *rtogs par thugs su chud pa* ("having placed [comprehension] in one's mind with regard to [correct] understanding"?). If it is correct that *chud pa* means the same in both *thugs su chud pa* as well as *khong du chud pa*, it must mean "internalize" (as in, in for example, *rgyu 'bras rnams khong du chud*, "understanding causes and results", SGAM PO SPYAN SNGA, *sNgon 'gro*, p. 87,6-7). Nonetheless, *chud pa* as such can be intransitive (similar to Skt. *gata*), which is EDGERTON's interpretation in his BHSD entry *gatiṃgata*: "skilled, experienced, adept, perh. lit. 'gone to understanding', so Tib. regularly *rtogs pa khong du chud pa*, entered within understanding." On *khong du chud*, see also ZIMMERMANN, *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra*, p. 49f. ▪ At any rate, the situation is quite different from, e.g., the word *tathāgata*, which, although it certainly indicates spiritual understanding (see SCHMITHAUSEN, "Gestalt des Buddha", p. 8), is always translated literally into Tibetan (*de bzhin gshegs pa* or *de bzhin 'ongs pa*) and, normally, into Chinese (如来, though sometimes simply 佛). ▪ The component *gata* is translated quite literally in ASVy$_c$: "Having arrived at the excellent realm (!) of effortlessness (來到於究竟無功用處, ASVy$_c$ 733a3)." Of course, "arrived at" is used, both in Sanskrit and Chinese, in a rather figurative sense, and it resembles expressions like *sugatiṃ gamissasi* ("they will go to the good destiny") at Vin II, p. 195 (see PTSD, s.v. *gacchati*), or *kāmarūpagatiṅgatā, bhavaggatam pi sampattā, puna*

---

gacchanti duggatiṃ ("Having gone to the destiny of a desired shape, having even attained the peak of existence, again they go to the bad destiny") in the *Vibhāga*, p. 426. On *gatigata* in the sense of "gone through [the prescribed legal] procedures") in Theravāda Vinaya literature, see VON HINÜBER, "Buddhist Law ", p. 165f. For *gata* in the sense of "type of" (i.e. "belonging to"), see the discussion of *rūpagata* (Tib. *gzugs kyi rnam pa*) or *dṛṣṭigata* (Tib. *lta ba'i rnam pa'am lta bar gyur pa*) in DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 573f., n. 267. ▪ It seems that in standard Sanskrit, *gati* usually appears meaning "journey, course", or "gait", but less frequently also as "attainment [of a goal]" (see *ibid.*, p. 467, n. 3), while in Buddhist cosmology, it can stand for more or less physical realms one goes to, or for certain modes of existence within those realms. Beings of different *gatis*, such as humans, animals, and *pretas*, for example, may find themselves roaming the same geographical location. See also NAKAMURA, "Erwachen", p. 49, n. 10, and my notes on *buddhaviṣaya*, below. ▪ AS-dPang-lo (fol. 250a) follows the reading *rtogs* of $ASVy_t$, paraphrasing *anābhogagatiṃgatā* as "having obtained effortless insight (*lhun gyis grub pa'i rtogs pa brnyes shing*)". The spelling *rtogs* is also used at AS-Bu-ston, p. 563,1 (*sangs rgyas lhun grub kyi rtogs pa khong du chud cing ...*). In BO DONG's paraphrase we find the expression *rnam rtog* which is an antonym for *rtogs pa* (and not *gtogs pa*): "Although the Buddhas have neither effort nor coarse imagination... (*sangs rgyas rnams 'bad rtsol dang rnam rtog mi mnga' yang ...*, AS-Bo-dong-bShad, p. 633,5-6)." See also NEGI, *Tibetan-Sanskrit*, s.v. *rtogs par khong du chud pa*. NEGI has not come across the spelling *gtogs par khong du* (or, *thugs su*) *chud pa*. ▪ My editorial method is basically not to improve upon the original translation even where I find it faulty. In this case, three facts speak in favour of an original reading *gtogs par khong du chud pa*: 1.) It is found in all versions of $ASBh_t$, 2.) *gTogs pa* would be a rare but acceptable equivalent for *gati*, and 3.) It is not the easier reading when compared to *rtogs par khong du chud pa*. Still, I chose to treat it as a scribal error and emend the $ASBh_t$ to *rtogs pa* because the $ASVy_t$ and all the AS commentaries I consulted, seem to read *rtogs pa*, and because I found no occurrence of *gtogs par khong du* (or, *thugs su*) *chud pa* elsewhere—against many occurrences of *rtogs*. • The commentary by 'JAM DBYANGS BLO 'GROS suggests that effortlessness is the result of reaching "one taste" with the *dharmadhātu*: "Finally, having merged into the realm (**dhātu*) of the wisdom free from coarse imagination [which is] the ultimate *dharmakāya*, the nature of all Buddhas, and having attained one taste, one, without endeavour or exertion, [....] performs the tasks of a Buddha effortless and unceasingly [on the plane of] veiled [truth] (*mthar thug sangs rgyas thams chad kyi ngo bo don dam chos kyi sku rnam par mi rtog pa' ye shes kyi dbyings su 'dres shing ro gcig brnyes nas / 'bad pa dang rtsol ba med bzhin du / kun rdzob* [...] *sangs rgyas kyi mdzad pa lhun gyis grub cing rgyun mi 'chad pa[r] sgrub pa* [...]). Here, effortlessness appears rather as a by-product of union with the *dharmadhātu* (ultimate truth), which helps accomplishing the tasks without effort (conventional truth, for which 'JAM DBYANGS BLO 'GROS here uses the term *kun rdzob*, "completely veiled", which is the interpretation presented in KRANG-DBYI-SUN, ed., *Tshig mdzod chen mo*, s.v. *rdzob pa*). It seems to me that effortlessness (*anābhoga*) as such has a soteriological value in the ASBh (similar to the Tibetan expression *bya bral* for a realized yogin), and that the *contradiction* between *anābhoga* and carrying out the tasks is considered inconceivable. That understanding is also reflected in BO DONG's above-mentioned phrasing "Although (*yang*) the Buddhas

have neither effort nor coarse imagination..." In 'JAM DBYANGS BLO 'GROS commentary, effortlessness is not more than the mode (... *bzhin du* ...) in which the tasks are carried out. That phrasing indicates that 'JAM DBYANGS BLO 'GROS was less willing to emphasize a friction between *anābhoga* and *buddhakṛtya*, and it might further indicate that he relied on the Tibetan translation, not the Sanskrit MS, when writing his commentary.

[536] "Effortlessness" in ASVy$_c$ 733a3: 無功用. According to NAKAMURA et al. (*Iwanami bukkyōjiten*, s.v. 無功用), *anābhoga* is a state of mind without volitional activity (意識的所作) which nonetheless allows acts for the benefit of others (利他行). It is attained on the eighth Bodhisattva level, wherefore it has become a generic term for the three highest Bodhisattva levels. I assume that not all the occurrences of the term (as listed, e.g., in BHSD, s.v.) presuppose such a clear-cut definition, but in the ASBh passage under research, *anābhoga* in the sense a non-volitional state of mind attained by the Buddhas would fit in smoothly. • Indeed, it seems that Mi pham, commenting upon the *Madhyāntavibhāga*, found it quite puzzling that "*anābhoga*" and the like are sometimes attributed to the Buddha exclusively, sometimes to the Bodhisattvas from the eight stage on. It is sometimes hard to see Mi pham's qualities as a scholar in his commentaries, especially when those are not much more than summaries. In this passage, in contrast, Mi pham is adorably honest in admitting that he could not solve that systematical problem conclusively (see MAITREYA, *Unterscheidung zwischen der Mitte und Extremen*, p. 180f.). It thus comes to no surprise that issues as such were considered "inconceivable" in earlier texts. • According to the *Daśabhūmikasūtra* (see RAHDER, "Seventh Stage", pp. 217-219), effortlessness in all activities is attained during the seventh stage. The first six stages (with effort, *ābhoga*, on which see AHN, *Lehre von den* Kleśas, p. 316) can be distinguished from stage eight to nine (effortless, *anābhoga*, Chin. 無功用, RAHDER: "without conscious effort"). According to RAHDER (art. cit., p. 217) the same doctrine is taught in the *Mahāvastu*. It is also said that *anābhoga* makes a deterioration (of spiritual attainment) impossible (*ibid.*). See also WILLIAMS, *Mahāyāna Buddhism*, p. 212, or Dayal, *Bodhisattva Doctrine*, p. 290.

[537] According to VinSg$_{t,P}$ *'i* 30b4-5, the purification (**viśuddhi*, "purification" should probably be understood here in the sense of the end result of purifying, i.e. the state of being purified) of the *dharmadhātu* is that characteristic of the transformation of the basis (*āśrayaparivṛtti*) of a Buddha which necessitates that transformation's being unthinkable (and permanent). Or, to put it the other way: If the purification of the *dharmadhātu* was not a characteristic of a Buddha's transformation of the basis, the latter would necessarily be thinkable (and impermanent). See SAKUMA, *Āśrayaparivṛtti*, vol. 1, p. 142 and vol. 2, pp. 191, and 197. I assume that the author of the ASBh has that doctrine in mind when he stresses that the Buddhas have blended with ("attained the state of one taste with") the *dharmadhātu*: It is an additional argument for a Buddha's activity being unthinkable. See also AHN, *Lehre von den Kleśas*, p. 3, n. 12 on the concept of non-duality (*advaya*). ▪ On *ekarasa*, MONIER-WILLIAM's entry ("the only pleasure, only object of affection") is rather misleading, ignoring BÖHTLINGK and ROTH's (*Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, s.v.) "der einzige Geschmack." The entry in BAREAU, "Viṃśatikā and Triṃśikā", is very clear: "the absolute nature, like [...] space, has but [one] savour". Cf. DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p.

535, n. 177: "a mental state completely turned inwards, unmixed with other emotional or cognitive processes, and most notably, unobstructed by [...] discursive thinking." If that definition applies for the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, it is a more a more psychological description of that state, while I consider the understanding of *ekarasatā* in the ASBh more ontological. ▪ The AS does not use the term *dharmadhātu* here. In contrast, some passages in the *Cintamayībhūmi* (e.g., YBh_c 363a3) even explain the *dharmakāya* of the Tathāgata as being unthinkable (see DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 227, n. 171). Also MSg X.3 mentions the *dharmakāya*'s relation to the transformation of the basis, the Ten Kinds of Control, its non-duality and its being inconceivable. See FRAUWALLNER, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, p. 347.

538 The term *dharmadhātu*, is here of course not meant as a synonym of the *dharmāyatana*, but as a kind of "realm of truth" attained by the Buddha through (among other factors) a direct perception of the Four Noble Truths on the Path of Seeing. See LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, pp. 751-754, SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavinjñāna*, p. 204, GRIFFITHS, et. al., *Realm of Awakening*, pp. 14-20, or SAKUMA, *Āśrayaparivṛtti*, pp. 109-111, 142-145.

539 What exactly are the contents of the Buddha-range of the Buddhas was nonetheless contested (see KRITZER, "Unthinkable Matters", p. 69), especially when it comes to the question of how the Buddha can know the future (see *ibid.*, pp. 67, and 69-71). As we see, this controversial issue is not addressed in this AS passage. • The semantic ranges of *gati* and *viṣaya* partly overlap in the case of one's destiny after death (see SCHMITHAUSEN, *Sentience of Plants*, p. 81, also for *yoni*) and, as we see here, in the case of the sphere of a Buddha. I think this is one of the instances where we see a parallel between the description of the otherworld one goes to after death and the otherworld attained by the Buddhist Path (*mārga*). The terminology may not be part of the shamanic heritage of Buddhism, but it is at least a reminder. See also DELEANU, *Mundane Path*, p. 584f., n. 310 on the term *upasaṃpadyata*, which is used for a.) the path through the eight meditative attainments, as well as b.) for rebirth.

TECHNICAL NOTES ON TRANSCRIPTION AND REFERENCES

Usage of Sanskrit Terms in the Main Text

Sanskrit terms that consist of one word only are always quoted in their stem form. In the case of adjectives, the masculine stem form is used. All terms that consist in more than one word appear in the nominative (normally singular), even if their position in the English sentence would necessitate another case form.[1] The term Dharma is capitalized when referring to religious doctrines, and in lowercase italics in its other usages.[2]

[1] In this respect, I follow DELHEY, *Samāhitā Bhumiḥ*, p. viii.

[2] Cf. HIRAKAWA, *Indian Buddhism*, p. 45.

Romanization of Japanese

Japanese is transcribed according to the modified Hepburn system.[1] This unfortunately implies ambiguities regarding the orthography in *kana* as in the case of the particles *wa*, *e*, and *o*. When referring to Japanese sources, I have added the abbreviations ltrp (left-to-right-pagination) or rtlp (right-to-left-pagination) where both methods of pagination are used.

Romanization of Chinese

Chinese is romanized in the Pinyin system without tone marks.

Bibliographical References

I use the author-short-title system because I think it has two advantages over the author-year system which many contemporary authors prefer. Firstly, it informs the reader *which* work of a certain author I refer to without forcing the reader to flip to the bibliography. Even though many readers will instantly know what MAY (1971) deals with, that is different in the case of SCHMITHAUSEN (2000a) or RHYS DAVIDS (1890). Secondly, the author-year system may be misleading about the place a certain publication has in a discourse, especially in our field: Although HAKAMAYA (2001) is later than FRAUWALLNER (1994), it partly predates SCHMITHAUSEN (1987), while MCDERMOTT (1975) is more advanced than MCDERMOTT (1980). Also references like PRADHAN, ed., *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* are much clearer than PRADHAN, ed. (1971), and MAITREYA, *Unterscheidung zwischen der Mitte und Extremen*, is more simple than MAITREYA (2005), or *Madhyāntavibhāga*, Ger.trans., which is space-consuming in so far as it requires an extra entry in the bibliography.

---

[1] See KATSUMATA, *Kenkyusha's New Japanese-English Dictionary*, p. XVI and Ritter, *Oxford Manual of Style*, p. 315f.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note: When a non-English title is presented along with an English translation, asterisk indicates that this is my own translation, not provided by the publisher.

Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, ed. 1973- . *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

AKANUMA, Chizen. 1929. *Kanpa shibu shiagon goshōroku* (漢巴四部四阿含互照緑; The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas and Pāli Nikāyas). Nagoya: Hajinkaku Shobō.

AHN, Sung-Doo. 2003. *Die Lehre von den* Kleśas *in der Yogācārabhūmi*. Stuttgart: F. Steiner.

ANACKER, Stefan. *Seven Works of Vasubandhu: The Buddhist Psychological Doctor*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984.

ARAMAKI, Noritoshi (荒牧 典俊). 1967. "Paratantrasvabhāva (I): A Diagrammatic Account". *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū*, vol. (30) 15, 2, pp. 40-54 (955-941).

ASAṄGA. 2001. *Abhidharmasamuccaya: The Compendium of the Higher Teaching (Philosophy)*. Translated by Sara Boin-Webb. Fremont: Asian Humanities Press.

AYMORÉ, Fernando. 1995. *Die zehn Arten von gutem und bösem Karma nach der Savitarkādi Bhūmi der Yogācārabhūmi*. M.A. thesis, Universität Hamburg.

BANDURSKI, Frank. 1994. "Übersicht über die Göttinger Sammlungen der von Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana in Tibet aufgefundenen buddhistischen Sanskrit-Texte." In *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur*. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoek und Ruprecht, pp. 9-125.

BAREAU, André. 1953. "Index of Viṃśatikā and Triṃśikā of Vasubandhu", *Vāk*, no. 3, pp. 102-128.

___. 1955. "Abhidharmakośakārikā of Vasubandhu: Index." *Vāk*, no. 3, pp. 45-83.

BCOM LDAN RIG PA'I RAL GRI. 2006. "Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i rnam bshad rgyan gyi me tog." In DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG, ed., *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 57, pp. 11-665.

BDE RDZOGS SMIN, ed. 1988. *mNgon rtogs rgyan dang dbu ma la 'jug pa'i rtṣa ba bzhugs so*. Chendu: Si-khron-mi-rigs-dpe-skrun-khang.

BENDALL, Cecil. 1922. *Śikṣāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhistic Teachings compiled by Śāntideva chiefly from Earlier Mahāyāna-Sūtras*. London: John Murray.

BERNHARD, Franz. 1965-1990. *Udānavarga*. 3 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoek und Ruprecht.

BEYER, Stephen. 1992. *The Classical Tibetan Language*. Albany: State University of

New York Press.

BHATTACHARYA, Vidhishekhara. 1957. *Yogācārabhūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga: The Sanskrit Text Compared with the Tibetan Version,* part 1. Calcutta: University of Calcutta.

BHIKKHU ARIYESAKO. 1998. *The Bhikkhus' Rules: A Guide for Laypeople: The Theravadin Buddhist Monk's Rules.* Kallista: Sanghāloka Forest Hermitage. Unpaginated electronic text, retrieved 5 January 2004 from www.accesstoinsight.org/lib/ modern/ariyesako/layguide.html.

BHIKKHU BODHI, 1990. "Nourishing the Roots: Essays on Buddhist Ethics". The Wheel Publication No. 259/260. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society. Unpaginated electronic text, retrieved 5 September 2008 from www.accesstoinsight.org/lib/authors/bodhi/ wheel259.html.

___, ed. 1999. *A Comprehensive Manual of Abhidhamma: The Abhidhammattha Sangaha of Ācariya Anuruddha.* 2nd ed. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.

BLEZER, Henk. 1997. *Kar gliṅ źi khro: A Tantric Buddhist Concept.* Leiden: Research School CNWS.

BLO GSAL BSTAN SKYONG. 1971. *On the History of the Monastery of Zhwa-lu: Being the Text of the Zhwa lu gdan rabs and the Autobiography by Zhwa lu Ri sbug Sprul sku Blo gsal bstan skyong.* Leh: S.W. Tashigangpa.

BOCK, Andreas. 1984. *Der Sāgara-Gaṅgāvatarana-Mythus in der episch-purāṇischen Literatur.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

BO DONG PAṆ CHEN PHYOGS LAS RNAM RGYAL. 1970. "sLob dpon 'phags pa thogs med kyis mdzad pa'i chos mngon pa kun las btus pa." In id., *Encyclopedia Tibetica: the Collected Works of Bo-doṅ Paṇ-chen Phyogs-las-rnam-rgyal,* vol. 16. New Delhi: Tibet House Library Publications, pp. 1-122.

___. 1970. "mNgon pa kun las btus pa de nyid bshad pa". In id., *Encyclopedia Tibetica: the Collected Works of Bo-doṅ Paṇ-chen Phyogs-las-rnam-rgyal,* vol. 16. New Delhi: Tibet House Library Publications, pp. 123-803.

BÖHTLINGK, Otto. 1887. *Pāṇini's Grammatik.* Leipzig: Haessel.

BÖHTLINGK, Otto and Rudolph ROTH. 1855-1872. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch.* St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.

___. 1879-1889. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung.* St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.

BLO GTER DBANG PO. 1996. *mNgon pa mdzod rtsa 'grel.* Chengdu: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

BRONKHORST, Johannes. 2000. *Karma and Teleology: A Problem and Its Solutions in Indian Philosophy.* Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

BRUNNER, Helene, André PADOUX, and Gerhard OBERHAMMER. 2000. *Tāntrikābhidhānakośa I: Dictionnaire des termes de la litterature hindoue tantrique; A Dictionary of Technical Terms from Hindu Tantric Literature; Wörterbuch zur Terminologie hinduistischer Tantren.* Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie

der Wissenschaften.

BSOD NAMS GRAGS PA. 1985-1988. "Chos mngon pa kun btus kyi dka' ba'i gnad dgrol ba'i bka' mkhas pa'i yid 'phrog." In *The Collected Works* (gsung 'bum) *of Paṇ chen bSod nams grags pa*. vol. 9 (*ta*). Drepung Loseling Library Society, pp. 1-108 .

BUESCHER, Hartmut. 2007. *Sthiramati's Trimśikāvijñaptibhāṣya: Critical Edition of the Sanskrit Text and its Tibetan Translation.* Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

___. 2008. *The Inception of Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

BU STON RIN CHEN GRUB. 1965-1971. "bDe bar gshegs pa'i bstan pa'i gsal byed chos kyi 'byung gnas gsung rab rin po che'i mdzod." In *The Collected Works of Bu ston*, vol. 24. New Delhi: International Acadamy of Indian Culture, pp. 633-1055 (fols. 1a-212a).

___. 1965-1971. "Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i rnam bshad nyi ma'i 'od zer." In *The Collected Works of Bu ston*, vol. 20. New Delhi: International Acadamy of Indian Culture, pp. 79-747 (fols. 1a-335a).

___. 1965-1971. "Bla ma dam pa rnams kyi rjes su bzung ba'i tshul bka' drin rjes su bzung ba'i tshul bka' 'drin rjes su dren par byed pa". In *The Collected Works of Bu ston*, vol. 26. New Delhi: International Acadamy of Indian Culture, pp. 1-142 (fols. 1a-71b).

___. 1965-1971. "bsTan 'gyur gyi dkar chag yid bzhin nor bu dbang gi rgyal po'i phreng ba" In *The Collected Works of Bu ston*, vol. 26. New Delhi: International Acadamy of Indian Culture, pp. 401-643 (fols. 1a-122a).

BZAD PA RING MO. 2006. "Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i rnam par bshad pa gsal ba'i rgyan." In DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG, ed., *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 41, pp. 11-373.

CHANG, Garma C.C. 1986. *Six Yogas of Naropa & Techings of Mahamudra*. Ithaca: Snow Lion.

CHIMPA, Lama, and Alaka CHATTOPADHYAYA, transl. 1970. *Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India*. Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study.

CSIKSZENTMIHALY, Mihaly. 1997. *Creativity: Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention.* New York: Perennial.

CHOI, Jong-Nam. 2001. *Die dreifache Schulung (Śikṣā) im frühen Yogācāra. Der 7. Band des Hsien-yang shêng-chiao lun.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

___. 2002. *Der Index zum Hsien-yang shêng-chiao lun (Skt.-Tib.-Chin. & Chin.-Skt.-Tib.)*. N.p.: Institut für den traditionellen koreanischen Buddhismus.

CHOONG, Mun-keat (Wei-keat). 2000. *The Fundamental Teachings of Early Buddhism: A Comparative Study Based on the Sūtrāṅga Portion of the Pāli Saṃyutta-Nikāya and the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

COLSMAN, Michael. 1990. *Definitionen psychologisch-ethischer Faktoren in der systematischen Philosophie des Buddhismus: Auf der Grundlage eines lamaistischen Textes von Gegän Gyatso.* Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus-Verlagsgesellschaft.

CONE, Margaret. 2001. *A Dictionary of Pāli.* Part I. Oxford: The Pāli Text Society.

CONZE, Edward. 1967. *Buddhist Thought in India.* Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

COX, Collett. 1995. *Disputed Dharmas: Early Buddhist Theories on Existence. An Annotated Translation of the Section on Factors Dissociated from Thought from Saṅghabhadra's Nyāyānusara.* Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

CÜPPERS, Christoph, ed. 2004. *The Relationship between Religion and State (*chos srid zung 'brel*) in traditional Tibet.* Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute.

'DAR STOD DGRA 'DUL BANG PO. 1987. "Tha snyad rig gnas lnga ji ltar byung ba'i tshul gsal bar byed pa blo gsal mgrin rgyan legs bshad nor bu'i phreng ba." In MANG THOS KLU SGRUB RGYA MTSHO and 'DAR STOD DGRA 'DUL DBANG PO, *bsTan rtsis gsal ba'i nyin byed, Tha snyad rig gnas lnga'i byung tshul blo gsal mgrin rgyan,* [Lha sa:] Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, pp. 253-329.

DAYAL, Hal. 1932. *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature.* London: Keegan, Trench, Trubner & Co.

DE JONG, Jan Willem. 1972. "Notes à propos des colophons du Kanjur", in *Zentralasiatische Studien,* vol. 6, pp. 505-559.

___. 1973. "Walpola Rahula, *Le compendium de la super-doctrine (philosophie) (Abhidharmasamuccaya) d'Asaṅga.*" Review article. *T'oung Pao* 59, pp. 339-346.

DELEANU, Florin. 2006. *The Chapter on the Mundane Path* (Laukikamārga) *in the* Śrāvakabhūmi. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

DELHEY, Martin. 2009. *Samāhitā Bhumiḥ: Das Kapitel über die meditative Versenkung im Grundteil der* Yogācārabhūmi. Wien: Arbeitskreit für tibetische und buddhistische Studien.

DGE 'DUN CHOS 'PHEL. 1986. *gTam rgyud gser gyi thang ma: With an Introduction cum Review by Ven. S. Rinpoche.* [Sarnath:] Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies.

DIEMBERGER, Hildegard, et al. 1997. *Feast of Miracles: The Life and the Tradition of Bodong Chole Namgyal (1375/5-1451 A.D.) according to the Tibetan Texts "Feast of Miracles" and "The Lamp Illuminating the History of Bodong".* Clusone: Porong Pema Chöding Editions.

DIMITROV, Dragomir. 2007. *Śabdālamkāradoṣavibhāga: Unterscheidung der Lautfiguren und Fehler.* Electronic text. Marburg, no publisher.

DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG, ed. 2006. *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs sgrig.* 60 vols. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG, ed. [author unknown] 2006. "Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i bshad pa rnam bshad snying po legs bshad kyi 'od zer" In *id.,* ed., *bKa'*

gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs, vol. 41, pp. 379-602.

___. 2007. *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs sgrig thengs gnyis pa'i dkar chag*, vol. 2. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

DPANG LO TSĀ BA BLO GROS BRTAN PA. "Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i rgya cher 'grel pa shes bya'i gsal byed." In *The collected works of Dpang-lo-blo-gros-brten-pa*. [Kathmandu]: Sa skya rgyal yongs gsung rab slob gnyer khang, 1999.

DUTT, Nalinaksha. 1976. *Mahāyāna Buddhism*. Corrected reprint. Calcutta: KLM Private Ltd.

___. 1978. *Buddhist Sects in India*. 2nd ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

___, ed. 1966. *Bodhisattvabhūmih* (*Being the XVth Section of Asaṅga's Yogācārabhūmi*). Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

DPA' RIS BLO BZANG RAB GSAL. 1991. "mNgon pa gong ma'i lugs bzhin sems dang sems byung rnam par bzhag pa blo gros padmo bzhed pa'i nyin byed." In *dPa' ris blo bzang rab gsal gyi gsung 'bum*. N.p.: Krung go'i mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

DREYFUS, Georges. 1995. "Meditation as Ethical Activity". *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 2, pp. 28-54.

DUNG DKAR Blo bzang 'phrin las. 2002. *mKhas dbang dung dkar blo bzang 'phrin las mchog gis mdzad pa'i bod rig tshig mdzod chen mo shes bya rab gsal*. Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang.

___. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, vol. 2. New Haven: Yale University Press.

ECO, Umberto. 2001. *Come si fa una tesi di laurea: Le materie umanistiche*. Milano: Tascabili Bompiani.

EJIMA, Yasunori. 1989. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu, Chapter I: Dhātunirdeśa*. Tokyo: The Sankibo Press.

ENOMOTO, Fumio (榎本 文雄). 1979. "Āsrava (rō) no seiritusu ni tsuite: omo ni jainakyōten ni okeru" (āsrava(漏)の成立について　主にジャイナ教古層経典における; On the Origin of Āsrava: Mainly in the Senior Canons of the Jainas). *Bukkyōshigaku kenkyū*, 22-1, pp. 17-42 (ltrp).

___. 1989. "On the Annihilation of *karman* in Early Buddhism", *Transactions of the International Conference of Orientalists in Japan*, vol. 34, pp. 43-55.

___. 2003. "'Mūlasarvāstivādin" and "Sarvāstivādin"'. In CHOJNACKI, Christine, Jens-Uwe HARTMANN, and Volker M. TSCHANNERL, eds., *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka: Festgabe für Adelheit Mette*, Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

ERB, Felix. 1997. *Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti: Candrakīrtis Kommentar zu den "Siebzig Versen über die Leehrheit" des Nāgārjuna [Kārikās 1-14]*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

FERRARI, Alfonsa. 1958. *mK'yen brtse's Guide to the Holy Places of Central Tibet*. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

FOUCAULT, Michel. 1971. *L'ordre du discours*. Paris: Gallimard.

FRAUWALLNER, Erich. 1951. *On the Date of the Buddhist Master of the Law Vasubandhu*. Rome: IsMeo.

___. 1961. "Landmarks in the History of Indian Logic", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 5, pp. 125-148.

___. 1963. "Abhidharma-Studien: I. Pañcaskandhakam und Pañcavastukam", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 7, pp. 20-36.

___. 1971a. "Abhidharma-Studien III, IV", Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens 15, pp. 69-122.

___. 1994. *Die Philosophie des Buddhismus*. 4th ed. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

___. 1995. *Studies in Abhidharma Literature and the Origins of Buddhist Philosophical Systems*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

___. 2003. *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie*. 2 vols. Aachen: Shaker Verlag.

FUKUHARA, Ryōgon (福原 亮厳), ed. 1974. *Bonponzōyaku kan'yaku gappeki abidatsuma kusharon honshō no kenkyū: gōhon, zuiminbon*. (梵本蔵訳漢訳合璧阿毘達磨倶舎論本頌の研究：業品・随眠品; *Research on the Verse Text of the Abhidharmakośa: Sanskrit Original along with Tibetan, Chinese, English and Japanese Translations: Karmanirdeśa, Anuśayanirdeśa.) Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō.

FUNAHASHI, Issai (舟橋 一哉). 1954. *Gō no kenkyū* (業の研究; *A Study on *Karman*). Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

___. 1987. *Kusharon no genten kaimei: Gōbon* (倶舎論の原典解明・業品; The Original Text and Explanation of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*: *Karmanirdeśa*). Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

FUNAHASHI, Naoya (舟橋 尚哉). 1977. "Shijizai to jūjizai: Shoki yuishikironsho o chūshin to shite" (四自在と十自在—初期唯識論書を中心として; *Caturdhā-vaśita* and *daśa-vasitā*, Focusing on the Early Yogācāra Texts). *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 51.1, pp. 365-368.

___. 1991. "'Daijōabidatsumashūron' to shokiyuishikiron to no sengo ni tsuite" (『大乗阿毘達磨集論』と初期唯識論書との先後について; *On the Sequence of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and the Early Yogācāra Texts), *Bukkyōgaku seminā*, no. 54, pp. 15-37.

'GAR DHARMA SMON LAM. 2006. "Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i bshad pa shes bya gsal byed." In DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG, ed., *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 42, pp. 11-560.

GESHE RABTEN. 1992. *Mind and its Functions*. Le Mont-Pèlerin: Editions Rabten Choeling.

GETHIN, Rupert. 1998. *The Foundations of Buddhism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

GLASENAPP, HELMUTH VON. 1986. *Indische Geisteswelt*. 2 vols. Hanau: Werner Dausien.

GLASS, Andrew. 2002. "Karma and Yogācāra Buddhism." Ph.D. Field Exam. Seattle: University of Washington.

GNOLI, Raniero, ed. 1977-1978. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu: Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin.* Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

GOKHALE, V.V. 1947a. "An Emendation in the text of the Abhidharmakośakārikā, IV, 74", *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 23, p. 12.

___. 1947b. "Fragments from the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* of Asaṅga", *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 23, pp. 13-38.

___. 1948. "A Rare Manuscript of Asaṅga's *Abhidharmasamuccaya*", *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 11, pp. 207-213.

'GOS LO TSĀ BA GZHON NU DPAL. 1974. *The Blue Annals: Completed in A.D. 1478 by Hgos-Lotsawa Gzhon-nu dpal.* New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.

GRIFFITHS, Paul J.

___. 1986. *On Being Mindless: Buddhist Meditation and the Mind-Body Problem.* La Salle: Open Court.

___. 1999. "Asaṅga, *Abhidharmasamuccaya*." In *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, vol. 8, pp. 434-452.

___, et al. 1989. *The Realm of Awakening: Chapter Ten of Asaṅga's Mahāyānasaṃgraha.* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

GUENTHER, Herbert [V]. 1956. *Der Buddha und seine Lehre nach der Überlieferung der Theravādins.* Zürich: Rascher Verlag.

___. 1959. *The Jewel Ornament of Liberation by sGam.po.pa.* London: Rider.

GYATSO, Janet. 2003. "One Plus One Makes Three: Buddhist Gender, Monasticism, and the Law of the Non-excluded Middle", *History of Religions*, vol. 43, pp. 89-115.

GZHAN PHAN CHOS KYI SNANG BA. 1978. "Theg pa chen po chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i mchan 'grel nor bu'i me long" In id., *gZhung chen bcu gsum gyi mchan 'grel: Commentaries Expanding the Texts of the Chief Indic Buddhist Shāstras in Their Tibetan Translations*, vol.4 (*tsa*). Dehra Dun: D. G. Khochhen Tulku, pp. 259-593 (fols. 1a-168a).

HAKAMAYA, Noriaki (袴谷 憲昭). 1972. "On a Paragraph in the Dharmaviniścaya Chapter of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*", *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 41, pp. 40-51 (ltrp), 468-457(rtlp).

__. 1977. "Nathmal Tatia ed., *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāsyam*", review article. *Komazawa daigaku bukkyōgakubu ronshū* 8, pp. 255-262.

__. 1979. "*Viniścayasamgrahanī* ni okeru ārayashiki no kitei" (*Viniścayasaṃgrahaṇī* における アーラヤ識の規定; "The definition of *ālaya-vijñāna* in the *Viniścayasaṃgrahaṇī*"). *Tōyō Bunka Kenkyū Kiyō* 79, pp. 1-79 (ltrp).

___. 1988. "Shumittohauzen kyōju no ārayashikiron" (シュミットハウゼン教授のアーラヤ識論; *The Ālayavijñāna theory of Professor Schmithausen), *Komazawadaigaku Bukkyōgakubu Ronshū*, vol. 19, pp. 404-414.

___. 2001. *Yuishikishisō ronkō* (唯識思想論考, *Studies in Yogācāra Thought). Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan.

HALBFASS, Wilhelm. 2000. *Karma und Wiedergeburt im indischen Denken*. Kreuzlingen: Hugendubel.

HARADA, Wasō (原田 和宗). 1999. "'Kyōryōbu no "tansō no" shiki no nagare' to iu gainen e no gimon (IV)" (<経量部の「単層の」識の流れ>という概念への疑問 (IV); Some questions on the concept of "Der 'einschichtiger' Erkenntnis-strom der Sautrāntikas", IV), *Indogaku chibettogaku kenkyū* 4, pp. 22-66.

HARVEY, Peter. 1995. "Criteria for Judging the Unwholesomeness of Actions in the Texts of Theravāda Buddhism". *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, vol. 2, pp. 140-151.

___. 2000. *An Introduction to Buddhist Ethics: Foundations, Values, and Issues*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HARRISON, Paul. 1992. *Druma-kinnara-rāja-pariprccha-sūtra: A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Text (Recension A) Based on Eight Editions of the Kanjur and the Dunhuang Manuscript Fragment.* Tokyo: IIBS.

HEUPERS, Fenja. 1985. "The Foundation of Buddhist Ethics: Karma and Ethics in the Abhidharmasamuccaya." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

VON HINÜBER, Oskar. 2005. "Buddhist Law According to the Theravāda-*Vinaya*: A Survey of Theory and Practice" in Paul Williams, ed., *Buddhism: Critical Concepts in Religious Studies*. London: Routledge.

HIRAKAWA, Akira (平川 彰). 1973. *Kusharon sakuin: Dai ichi bu* (倶舎論索引・第一部; *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāsya, Part One*). Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan Kabushikigaisha.

___. 1977. *Kusharon sakuin: Dai ni bu* (倶舎論索引・第二部; *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāsya: Part Two*). Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan Kabushikigaisha.

___. 1978. *Kusharon sakuin: Dai san bu* (倶舎論索引・第三部; *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāsya, Part Three*). Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan Kabushikigaisha.

___. 1990. *A History of Indian Buddhism: From Śākyamuni to Early Mahāyāna*. Edited and translated by Paul Groner. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

___. 1993. "The Meaning of 'Dharma': The Buddhist Theory of Existence". In *Premier Colloque Étienne Lamotte*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Insitut Orientaliste, pp. 17-23.

HODGE, Stephen. 1990. *An Introduction to Classical Tibetan*. Warminser: Aris and Phillips.

HOERNLE, A. F. Rudolf. 1988. *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan,* vol. 1. Reprint. Delhi: Sri Satguru.

HONDA, Megumu (本田 恵). 1968. "Annotated translation of the Daśabhumika-Sūtra". In Denis Sinor, ed., *Studies in South, East and Central Asia: Presented as A Memorial Volume to the Late Professor Raghu Vira*. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, pp. 115-276.

HOPKINS, Jeffrey. 1996. "The Tibetan Genre of Doxography: Structuring a Worldview." In Jose Ignacio CABEZÓN and Roger R. JACKSON (eds.), *Tibetan Literature: Studies in Genre*, Ithaca: Snow Lion Publications, pp. 170-186.

HU-VON HINÜBER, Haiyan. 2002. "Some Remarks on the Sanskrit Manuscript of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Prātimokṣasūtra found in Tibet." In Ute Hüsken, et al. (eds.), *Jaina-itihāsa-ratna: Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90. Geburtstag*, Marburg, Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 2006, pp. 283-337.

ISHIHAMA, Yumiko (石浜 裕美子), and Yōichi FUKUDA (福田 洋一), eds. 1989. *A New Critical Edition of the Mahāvyutpatti Sanskrit-Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionary of Buddhist Terminology* (新訂翻訳名義大集). Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko.

ISHIKAWA, Mie (石川 美恵). 1990. *A Critical Edition of the* sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*: An Old and Basic Commentary on the Mahāvyutpatti* (二巻本訳語釈). Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko.

JACOBI, Hermann. 1932. *Triṃśikāvijñapti des Vasubandhu mit Bhāṣya des Ācārya Sthiramati*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

JACKSON, David P. 1987. *The Entrance Gate for the Wise (Section III): Sa-skya Paṇḍita on Indian and Tibetan Traditions of Pramāṇa and Philosophical Debate*. 2 vols. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.

___. 1994. *Enlightenment by a Single Means: Tibetan Controversies on the "Self-sufficient White Remedy"*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

___. 2004. *A Saint in Seattle: The Life of the Tibetan Mystic Dezhung Rinpoche*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

'JAD PA GZHON NU BYANG CHUB. 2006. "Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa ṭīkka shes bya thams cad gsal bar byed pa'i sgron me." In DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG, ed., *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 40, pp. 11-536.

JAINI, Padmanabh S. 1977. *Abhidharmadīpa with Vibhāṣāprabhāvṛtti*. 2nd ed. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.

___. 1977. "*Prajñā* and *dṛṣṭi* in the Vaibhāṣika Abhidharma." In Lewis Lancester, ed., *Prajñāpārimitā and Related Systems: Studies in Honour of E. Conze*. Berkeley: University of California, pp. 403-415.

___. 1992. "*Smṛti* in the Abhidharma Literature and the Development of Buddhist Accounts of Memory of the Past." In Janet GYATSO, ed., *In the Mirror of Memory: Reflections on Mindfulness and Remembrance in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism*. Albany: SUNY Press, pp. 47-60.

'JAM DBYANGS BLO GROS. 1977. "Dam pa'i chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i 'grel pa shes

bya rab gsal snang ba". In id., *mNgon pa kun btus kyi 'grel pa*. Gangtok: Gonpo Tseten.

'JAM DBYANGS MKHYEN BRTSE'I DBANG PO. 1989. "mDo sngags kyi bstan pa rin po che'i chos kyi 'byung tshul las brtsams pa'i lo rgyus dang rnam thar shin tu mang po ngo mtshar lha yi pad tshal". In id., *'Jam dbyangs mkhyen brtse'i dbang po'i gsung rtsom gces sgrig*. Chengdu: Si-khron-mi-rigs-dpe-skrun-khang, pp. 217-272.

JÄSCHKE, Heinrich August. 1881. *A Tibetan-English Dictionary*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

'JIGS BRAL YE SHES RDO RJE. 1991. *The Nyingma School of Tibetan Buddhism: Its Fundamentals and History*. Translated and edited by Gyurme Dorje with the collaboration of Matthew Kapstein. 2 vols. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

JINAPUTRA. *Byang chub sems dpa'i tshul khrims kyi le'u rgya cher 'grel pa*. ACIP TD4046.

'JU MI PHAM [JAMGÖN MIPHAM RINPOCHE]. 1984-1993. "mNgon pa kun btus kyi rnam grangs sna tshogs bshad pa." In id., *The Expanded Redaction of the Complete Works of 'Ju Mi-pham*, vol. 12, Paro: Lama Ngodrup and Sherab Drimey, pp. 401-510.

____. 2000. *Gateway to Knowledge: The Treatise Entitled The Gate for Entering the Way of a Pandita*, vol. 2. Hong Kong: Rangjung Yeshe Publications.

KATSUMATA, Senkichirō (勝俣 銓吉郎). 1954. *Kenkyusha's New Japanese-English Dictionary* (研究社新和英大辞典). 3rd ed. Tokyo: Kenkyūsha.

KAJIYOSHI, Kōun (梶芳 光運). 1964. "Agon ni arawareta keizaikan to keizaiken no tenkai"(阿含に現れた経済観と経済圏の展開, The economic views and economic sphere in the Aagama). In Yūki kyōju shōju kinen ronbun kankōkai (結城教授頌寿記念論文集刊行会), ed., *Yūki kyōju shōju kinen: Bukkyō shisōshi ronshū* (結城教授頌寿記念：仏教思想史論集), Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan, pp. 3-14.

KALUPAHANA, David J. 1992. *A History of Buddhist Philosophy: Continuites and Discontinuities*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

KARMA BDE LEGS, ed. 2006. *bKa' dgams gsung 'bum phyogs sgrig thengs gnyis pa'i dkar chag*. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

KAWAGOE, Eishin. 2005. *dKar chag 'phang thang ma*. Sendai: Tōhoku indo chibetto kenkyūkai.

KEENAN, John Paul. 1982. "Original Purity and the Focus of Early Yogācāra". *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies 5*, pp. 7-18.

____. 2004. "Asaṅga". In Robert E. BUSWELL (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, p. 32.

KHANG DKAR, Tshul khrims skal bzang (白館 戒雲). 2002. "Chibetto ni okeru *Abidaruma-shūron* no kenkyū: Pan Rotsāwa no 'chūshaku' o chūshin to shite" (チベットにおける『アビダルマ集論』の研究・パン・ロツァーワの『注釈』を中心として; Research on the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* in Tibet, Focusing upon the "Commentary" by dPang Lo tsā ba." In *Sakurabe Hajime Hakushi kiju kinenronshū*

"shoki bukkyō kara abidaruma he", edited by the Sakurabe Hajime Hakushi Kiju Kinen Ronshū Kankōkai. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, pp. 401-404.

KIEFFER-PÜLZ, Petra. 2000. "Die buddhistische Gemeinde". In Heinz BECHERT, et al., *Der Buddismus I: Der indische Buddhismus und seine Verzweigungen*. Religionen der Menschheit, vol. 24,1. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

KO ZHUL GRAGS PA 'BYUNG GNAS and RGYAL BA BLO BZANG MKHAS GRUB. 1992. *Gangs can mkhas grub rim byon ming mdzod*. Lanzhou: Gan su min zu zhu ban she.

KONG SPRUL BLO GROS MTHA' YAS [JAMGÖN KONGTRUL LODRÖ THAYÉ]. 1995. *Myriad Worlds: Buddhist Cosmology in Abhidharma, Kālacakra, and Dzog-chen*. Ithaca: Snow Lion Publications.

KRAGH, Ulrich Timme. 2006. *Early Buddhist Theories of Action and Result: A Study of* Karmaphalasambandha, *Candrakīrti's Prasannapadā, Verses 17.1-20*. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien.

KRAMER, Jowita. 2005. *Kategorien der Wirklichkeit im frühen Yogācāra: Der Fünf-*vastu*-Abschnitt in der* Viniścayasaṃgrahaṇī *der* Yogācārabhūmi. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

KRAMER, Ralf. 2005. *The Great Tibetan Translator: Life and Works of rNgog blo ldan shes rab (1059-1109)*. München: Indus Verlag.

KRANG DBYI SUN, ed. 1985. *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang..

KRITZER, Robert. 1999. *Rebirth and Causation in the Yogācāra Abhidharma*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, vol. 44. Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien.

___. 2002a. "Unthinkable Matters: The Term *acintya* in the *Abhidharmakoṣabhāṣya*." In *Sakurabe Hajime Hakushi kiju kinenronshū "shoki bukkyō kara abidaruma he"*, edited by the Sakurabe Hajime Hakushi Kiju Kinen Ronshū Kankōkai. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, pp. 401-404.

___. 2002b. "The 'Additional Leaf' of the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* Manuscript: the Results of the Ten Bad Courses of Action". *Journal Asiatique*, vol. 290.2, pp. 465-484.

___. 2005. *Vasubandhu and the Yogācārabhūmi: Yogācāra Elements in the Abhidharmakośa*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

KUDŌ, Noriyuki (工藤 順之), ed. 2004. *The Karmavibhaṅga: Transliterations and Annotations of the* Original *Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal*. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology.

LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, Louis de, ed. 1903-13. Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (*Mādhyamikasūtras*) *de Nāgārjuna avec la* Prasannapadā *commentaire de Candrakīrti*. St. Petersburg: Commissionnaires de l'Académie Impériale des sciences.

___. 1928-1948. *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi: La Siddhi de Hsuan-tsang*. Three volumes. Paris: Paul Geuthner.

___. 1927. *La morale bouddhique*. Paris: Nouvelle Librarie Nationale.

___. 1982. *The Way to Nirvāṇa*. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.

LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, Louis de, trans. 1971. *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*. 6 vols. 2nd ed. Bruxelles: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises.

LALOU, Marcelle. 1933. *Répertoire du Tanjur, d'après le catalogue de P. Cordier*. Paris: Bibliotheque Nationale.

___. 1953. "Les textes Bouddhiques au temps du Roi Khri-sroṅ-lde-bcan", *Journal Asiatique*, no. 241, pp. 313-353.

LAMOTTE, Étienne. 1935. *Samdhinirmocana Sūtra: L'Explication des Mystères*. Louvain: Université de Louvain.

___. 1938. *La Somme du Grand Véhicule d'Asaṅga (Mahāyānasaṃgraha)*, 2 vols. Louvain: Bureaux de Muséon.

___. 1936. "Le traité de l'acte de Vasubandhu (*Karma-siddhi-prakaraṇa*)", *Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques*, vol. 4, pp. 151-288.

___. 1958. *Histoire du bouddhisme indien: Des origines à l'ère Śaka*. Louvain: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste.

___. 1988. *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa: the Treatise on Action by Vasubandhu*. Translated by Leo M. Pruden. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press.

___. 1944-1980. *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse de Nāgārjuna*, 5 vols. Louvain: Institut Orientaliste Université de Louvain.

LÉVI, Sylvain. 1907. *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra: Exposé de la Doctrine du grand Véhicule*. 2 vols. Paris: Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études-Sciences Historiques et Philologiques.

___. 1925. *Deux traités de Vasubandhu: Viṃśatikā (La Vingtaine) accompagnée d'une explication en prose et Triṃśikā (La Trentaine) avec le commentaire de Sthiramati*. Paris: Librarie Ancienne Honoré Champion.

LOPEZ, Donald S. 1996. *Elaborations on Emptiness: Uses of the Heart Sūtra*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

LORENZ, Kuno. 1998. *Indische Denker*. München: Beck.

LUO, Zhu feng (羅 竹風), ed. 1987. *Hanyu dacidian* (漢語大詞典). Hongkong: Joint Publishing Co.

MAAS, Paul. 1960. *Textkritik*. 4 th edition. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft.

MAEDA, Takashi (前田 崇). 1991. "瑜伽論梵文研究 Ābhiprāyikārthagāthānirdeśa (釈意趣義伽地)", *Bunka*, vol. 54, pp. 62–92 (ltrp).

MAITHRIMURTHI, Mudagamuwe. 1999. *Wohlwollen, Mitleid, Freude und Gleichmut: Eine ideengeschichtliche Untersuchung der vier apramāṇas in der buddhistischen Ethik und Spiritualiät von den Anfängen bis hin zum frühen Yogācāra*. Stuttgart: F. Steiner.

MAITREYA, Ārya. 2005. *Die Unterscheidung zwischen der Mitte und Extremen mit Mipham Rinpotsches Kommentar Die Lichstrahlengirlande.* Berlin: Karl Brunnhölzl und Nitartha Institut.

MALALASEKERA, G.P., and K.N. JAYATILLEKE. 1974. Buddhism and the Race Question. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.

MANG THOS KLU SGRUB RGYA MTSHO (1523-?). 1987. "bsTan brtsis gsal ba'i nyin byed lhag bsam rab dkar." In MANG THOS KLU SGRUB RGYA MTSHO and 'DAR STOD DGRA 'DUL DBANG PO, *bsTan rtsis gsal ba'i nyin byed, Tha snyad rig gnas lnga'i byung tshul blo gsal mgrin rgyan*, [Lha sa:] Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, pp. 1-251.

MARTIN, Dan. 2002. "Gray Traces: Tracing the Tibetan Teaching Transmission of the *Mngon pa kun btus* (*Abhidharmasamuccaya*) through the Early Period of Disunity". In Helmut Eimer and David Germano (eds.), *The Many Canons of Tibetan Buddhism*. Leiden: Brill.

___. 2006. *Tibskrit Philology: Version March 10, 2006.* Edited by Alexander Cherniak. Electronic text, retrieved 1 August 2007 from http://www.eecs.berkeley.edu/~keutzer/martin/.

MATHES, Klaus-Dieter. 1996. *Unterscheidung der Gegebenheiten von ihrem wahren Wesen (Dharmadharmatāvibhāga). Eine Lehrschrift der Yogācāra-Schule in tibetischer Überlieferung.* Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

MATHEWS, Robert Henry. 1969. *Matthew's Chinese-English Dictionary.* Revised American edition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

MAY, Jacques. 1971. "La philosophie bouddhique idéaliste", *Asiatische Studien*, vol. 25, pp. 265-323.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred. 1953-1980. *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen.* Heidelberg: C. Winter.

___. 1992-2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen.* 3 vols. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

MCDERMOTT, James Paul. 1975. "The *Kathāvatthu* Kamma Debates", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 95, pp. 424-433.

___. 1980. "Karma and Rebirth in Early Buddhism." In *Karma and Rebirth in Classical Indian Traditions*, edited by Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, pp. 165-192.

___. 1984. *Development in the Early Buddhist Concept of Kamma / Karma.* New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

MCHIMS 'JAM PA'I DBYANGS. *Chos mngon mdzod kyi tshig le'ur byas pa'i 'grel pa mngon pa'i rgyan.* ACIP S6954.

MEJOR, Marek. 1991. *Vasubandhu's Abhidharmakośa and the Commentaries Preserved in the Tanjur.* Stuttgart : F. Steiner.

MIMAKI, Katsumi (御牧 克己). 1982. Blo gsal grub mtha'. Kyoto: Zinbun Kagaku Kenkyusyo.

MIMAKI, Katsumi (御牧 克己), Seitetsu MORIYAMA (森山 清徹), and Tōru TOMABECHI (苫米地 等流), trans. 1996. Tsonkapa. (ツォンカパ; *Tshong kha pa). Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha.

MOCHIZUKI, Shinkō (望月 信亨). 1936. Bukkyō daijiten (佛教大辭典; *Great Dictionary of Buddhism). 3rd ed. Tokyo: Bukkyō daijiten hakkōjo.

mTsho sngon Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, ed. 1985. *Bod kyi bstan bcos khag cig gi mtshan byang dri med shel dkar phreng ba*. Xining: mTsho sngon Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

MUMFORD, Stan Royal. 1989. *Himalayan Dialogue: Tibetan Lamas and Gurung Shamans in Nepal*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

MUROJI, Yoshihito (室寺 義仁). 1985. *Jōgōron: Chibettoyaku kōteibon* (成業論、チベット訳校訂本; *The Tibetan Text of the Karma-siddhi-prakaraṇa with Reference to the Abhidharma-kośa-bhāṣya and the Pratītya-samutpāda-vyākhyā: Critically Edited from the Cone, Derge, Narthang and Peking Editions of the Tibetan Tanjur*). Kyoto: Published by the author.

____. 1993. *Vasubandhus Interpretation des Pratītyasamutpāda. Eine kritische Bearbeitung der Pratītyasamutpādavyākhyā (Saṃskāra- und Vijñānavibhaṅga)*. Stuttgart: F. Steiner.

____. 1994. "Fudōgō (āneñjya / āniñjya-karma) ni tsuite: Naze "seija" tachi wa rinne suru no ka" (*About the "immovable *karman*": Why Do the "Āryas" Roam in Saṃsāra?; 「不動業」(āneñjya / āniñjya-karma)について: なぜ，「聖者」たちは輪廻するのか). *Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai Nenpō* 59, pp. 123-146

NAGAO, Gadjin M. (長尾 雅人). 1991. *Mādhyamika and Yogācāra: A Study of Mahāyāna Philosophies*. Albany: State University of New York.

____, ed. 1994. *An Index to Asaṅga's Mahāyānasamgraha*. 2 vols. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

NAGASAWA, Jitsudō. (長沢 実導). 1978. *Yugagyō shisō to mikkyō no kenkyū* (瑜伽行思想と密教の研究; *Research in Yogācāra Thought and Tantrism). Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha.

NAKAMURA, Ayako (中村 綾子). 2004. "Das Kapitel über das Erwachen des Buddha in der *Bodhisattvabhūmi*: Kritische Edition mit annotierter Übersetzung und Einleitung". M.A. thesis, Universität Hamburg.

NAKAMURA, Hajime (中村 元). 1975. *Bukkyōgo daijiten* (仏教語大辞典; *Great Dictionary of Buddhist Terminology). Tokyo: Tōkyō Shoseki.

____. 1980. *Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographical Notes*. Osaka: Kansai University of Foreign Studies.

____, et al. 1995. *Iwanami bukkyōjiten* (岩波仏教辞典, *Iwanami's Dictionary of Buddhism). CD-ROM. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

NĀRADA MAHĀ THERA. 1987. *A Manual of Abhidhamma: Being Abhidhammattha Saṅgaha of Bhadanta Anuruddhācariya.* Kuala Lumpur: Buddhist Missionary Society.

NEGI, J.S. 1993-2005. *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary.* Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies.

NGAG DBANG BLO GROS GRAGS PA. 1992. *dPal ldan jo nang pa'i chos 'byung rgyal ba'i chos tshul gsal byed zla ba'i sgron me.* Xining: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang.

NGAG DBANG SKAL LDAN RGYA MTSHO. 1996. *Shel dkar chos 'byung: History of the White Crystal. Religion and Politics of Southern La stod. Translation and Facsimile Edition of the Tibetan Text by Pasang Wangdu and Hildegard Diemberger in Cooperation with Guntram Hazod.* Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

NGAG DBANG NOR BU. 1998. *Mi dbang pho la ba'i gser bris bstan 'gyur srid zhi'i rgyan gcig gi dkar chag.* Electronic text TS4569a.act. New York: The Asian Classics Input project.

NGUYEN, Cuong Tu. 1990. *Sthiramati's Interpretation of Buddhology and Soteriology.* Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.

NISHIOKA, Soshu (西岡 祖秀). 1982. "'Putun bukkyōshi' Mokurokubusakuin II" (『プトゥン仏教史』目録部索引 I I; Index to the Catalogue Section of Bu ston's History of Buddhism II). *Tōhoku daigaku bungakubu bunkakōryūkenkyū shisetsu kiyō* 5, pp. 43-93.

NORMAN, K.R. 1982. "The Four Noble Truths: A Problem in Pāli Syntax". In *Indological and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on His Sixtieth Birthday,* edited by L.A. Hercus, et al. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, pp. 377-391.

NYANAMOLI, Bhikkhu. 1964. *The Path of Purification.* Columbo: A. Senage.

___. 1991. *The Discourse on Right View: The Sammādiṭṭhi Sutta and Its Commentary.* Edited and revised by Bhikkhu Bodhi. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society. Unpaginated electronic text, retrieved 5 January 2004 from http://www. accesstoinsight.org/lib/ bps/wheels/wheel377.html.

NYANAPONIKA, Mahathera. 1981. *Die Wurzeln von Gut und Böse.* Konstanz: Verlag Christiani.

___. 1989. *Geistestraining durch Achtsamkeit: Die buddhistische Satipaṭṭhāna-Methode.* Konstanz: Verlag Christiani.

NYANATILOKA. 1969. *Die Lehrreden des Buddha aus der Angereihten Sammlung: Neue Gesamtausgabe in fünf Bänden.* Köln: DuMont Schauberg.

___. 1975. *Visuddhi-Magga oder Der Weg zur Reinheit: Die grösste und älteste systematische Darstellung des Buddhismus (Buddhaghosa).* Konstanz.

___. 1980. *Buddhist Dictionary: Manual of Buddhist Terms and Doctrines.* 4th ed.

Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.

___. 1989. Buddhistisches Wörterbuch. Reprint of the second edition. Konstanz: Verlag Christiani.

OBERLIES, Thomas. 1997. "Neuer Wein in alten Schläuchen? Zur Geschichte der buddhistischen Ordensregeln." *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes*, vol. 15, pp. 171-204.

___. 2003. "Überblick über die kanonischen Texte der Śrāvakayāna-Schulen", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, 47, pp. 37-84.

OBERMILLER, Eugene. 1931-1932. *History of Buddhism* (Chos-ḥbyung) by Bu-ston. 2 vols. Leipzig: Harrasowitz.

ODANI, Nobuchiyo (小谷 信千代) and Tsultrim KELSANG [KHANG DKAR, Tshul khrims skal bzang]. 1991. *Bukkyō yugagyō shisō no kenkyū* (仏教瑜伽行の研究; A Study on Buddhist Yogācāra Thought). Kyoto: Buneidō Shoten.

OKADA, Shigeho (岡田 繁穂). 1992. "*Abidatsuma zōshūron* jobun chibetto yakukō (『阿毘達磨雑集論』序文チベット訳考; On the Foreword in the Tibetan Translation of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya-vyākhyā*). *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 40.2, pp. 914-910.

PAHLKE, Michael. 2000. *Der Vijñāna-Abschnitt des Pañcaskandhaka: Textkritische Edition mit Übersetzung, Erläuterungen und Einleitung.* M.A. thesis, Universität Hamburg.

PĀSĀDIKA, Bhikkhu. 1989. *Kanonische Zitate im Abhidharmakośabhāṣya des Vasubandhu.* Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 1: Göttingen: Vandenhoek und Ruprecht.

PE MAUNG-TIN. 1923-1931. *The Path of Purity*. 3 vols. London: Pali Text Society.

PERDUE, Daniel. 1992. *Debate in Tibetan Buddhism*. Ithaca: Snow Lion.

PETECH, Luciano. 1990. *Central Tibet and the Mongols: The Yüan-Sa-skya Period of Tibetan History*. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

POTTER, Karl H. "The Karma Theory and Its Interpretation in Some Indian Philosophical Systems". In *Karma and Rebirth in Classical Indian Traditions*, edited by Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, pp. 241-267.

POWERS, John. 1991. *The Yogācāra School of Buddhism: A Bibliography*. Metuchen and London: The American Theological Library Association and The Scarecrow Press.

___. 1992. *Two Commentaries on the Saṃdhinirmocana-sūtra*. Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press.

PRADHAN, Pralhad, ed. 1950. *Abhidharma Samuccaya of Asaṅga*. Visva-Bharati Studies, no. 12. Santiketan: Visva-Bharati.

___, ed. 1967. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*. K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

QUINE, Willard Von Orman. 1989. *Quiddities: An Intermittently Philosophical Dictionary*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

RAHDER, Johannes. 1926. "Daśabhūmika Sūtram. Seventh Stage", *Acta Orientalia* 4, pp. 214-256.

____. 1925. *Daśabhāmikasūtra*. Leuven: J.B. Istas.

RDZA DPAL SPRUL. 1989. *sNying thig sngon 'gro'i khrid yig kun bzang bla ma'i zhal lung*. Chendu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

REAT, N.R. 1982. *The Divine Tree: A Tibetan Mnemonic Grammar Poem*. Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives.

___. 1998. "The Historical Buddha and His Teachings". In *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, vol. 7.

RED MDA' BA GZHON NU BLO GROS. 1999. "Dam pa'i chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i snying po legs bshad nor bu'i phreng ba." In id., *Red mda' ba gzhon nu blo gros kyi gsung skor*, vol. 2 (*kha*). Mussoorie: Sakya College, pp. 1-86.

REEVES, Gene 1998. "Appropriate Means as an Ethical Doctrine in the *Lotus Sūtra*". *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 5, pp. 241-260.

RGYAL TSHAB DAR MA RIN CHEN. 1982 "Dam pa'i chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i rnam bshad legs par bshad pa chos mngon rgya mtsho'i snying po." In *rGyal tshab rje'i gsung 'bum*, vol. 3 (*ga*). sKu 'bum: sKu 'bum byams pa gling par khang, pp. 459-929.

RHYS DAVIDS, T. W., trans. 1890. *The Questions of King Milinda: Part I of II*. Sacred Books of the East, vol. 35. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

RHYS DAVIDS, T. W., and William STEDE, ed. 1972. *The Pāli Text Society's Pāli-English Dictionary*. London: The Pāli Text Society.

RITTER, R.M. 2003. *Oxford Style Manual*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ROERICH, George N. 1939. *The Blue Annals: Part I*. Calcutta: Royal Asiatic Society.

___. 1953. *The Blue Annals: Part II*. Calcutta: Asiatic Society.

ROSENBERG, Otto. 1924. *Die Probleme der buddhistischen Philosophie*. Leipzig: 1924.

ROSPATT, Alexander von. 1995. *The Buddhist Doctrine of Momentariness: A Survey of the Origins and Early Phase of this Doctrine up to Vasubandhu*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

RUEGG, David Seyfort. 1963. "The Jo naṅ pas: A School of Buddhist Ontologists According to the Grub mtha' shel gyi me long", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 83, no. 1, pp. 73-91.

___. 1966. *The Life of Bu ston Rin po che with the Tibetan text of the Bu ston rNam thar*. Roma, IsMEO.

___. 1989. *Buddha-Nature, Mind and the Problem of Gradualism in a Comparative Perspective: On the Transmission and Reception of Buddhism in India and Tibet*. London: SOAS.

___. 1981. *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India*. Wiesbaden:

Harrassowitz.

___. 2002. *Two Prolegomena to Madhyamaka Philosophy*. Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien.

RYŌSE, Wataru S. (両瀬 渉). 1987. "A Study of the *Abhidharmahrdaya*: The Historical Develpment of the Concept of Karma in the Sarvastivada Thought." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin.

SAEKI, Kyokuga (佐伯 旭雅). 1978. *Kandō abidatsuma kusharon* (冠導阿毘達磨俱舎論). Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

SAKAKI, Ryūsaburō. 1916-1925. *Mahāvyupatti*, vols. 1 and 2. Kyoto: Kyōto Daigaku.

SAKUMA, Hidenori (佐久間 秀範). 1990. *Die Āśrayaparivṛtti-Theorie in der Yogācārabhūmi*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

___. 1996. *Tatia kōteiban* Abidatsumazōshūron *bongo sakuin oyobi korigenda* (タティア校訂版『阿毘達磨雑集論』梵語索引およびコリゲンダ; *Sanskṛt Word-Index to the Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣyam Edited by N. Tatia with the Corrigenda*). Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.

SAKURABE, Hajime (櫻部 建). 1960. *Hagabon no kenkyū* (破我品の研究; A study on Pudgalaviniścaya). *Ōtani daigaku kenkyū nenpō*, no. 12, pp. 21-112.

___. 1975. *Bukkyōgo no kenkyū* (佛教語の研究; *Studies in Buddhist Language). Kyoto: Bun'eidō.

___. and Shunpei UEYAMA (上山 春平). 1996. *Sonzai no bunseki (Abidaruma)* (存在の分析<アビダルマ>; The Analysis of Existence [Abhidharma]). Tokyo: Kadokawa Bunko.

ŚĀ KYA MCHOG LDAN. 1975. "Dam pa'i chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i rnam par bshad pa rnal 'byor spyod gzhung rgya mtsho'i rlabs kyi phreng ba". In *The Complete Works (*gsung 'bum*) of gSer mdog Paṇ chen Śākya mchog ldan*. Thimphu: Kunzang Tobgey, pp. 1-340.

SASAKI, Genjun (佐々木 現順). 1990. *Gōron no kenkyū* (業論の研究; A Study of Karma Doctrine). Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

SCHMITHAUSEN, Lambert. 1967. "Sautrāntika-Voraussetzungen in *Viṃśatikā* und *Triṃśikā*". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 11, pp. 109-136

___. 1969. *Der Nirvāṇa-Abschnitt in der Viniścayasaṃgrahaṇī der Yogācārabhūmiḥ*. Wien: Hermann Böhlaus Nachf.

___. 1969. "Zur Literaturgeschichte der älteren Yogācāraschule", *Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft,* Supplement I.3, pp. 813-823.

___. 1970. "Zu den Rezensionen des *Udānavargā*", *Wiener Zeitschrift fur die Kunde Südasiens* 14, pp. 47-124.

___. 1971. "Philologische Bemerkungen zum Ratnagotravibhāga", In *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 15, pp. 123-177.

___. 1972. "The Definition of Pratyaksam in the Abhidharmasamuccayah", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 16, pp. 153-164.

___. 1976. "Zu Walpola Rahulas Übersetzung von Asaṅga's *Abhidharmasamuccaya*", review article. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 20, pp. 111-122.

___. 1976b. " On the Problem of the Relation of Spiritual Practice and Philosophical Theory in Buddhism." In Cultural Department, Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, New Delhi (ed.), *German Scholars on India.* Contributions to Indian Studies, vol. 2. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, pp. 235-250.

___. 1976c. "Die vier Konzentrationen der Aufmerksamkeit. Zur geschichtlichen Entwicklung einer spirituellen Praxis des Buddhismus", *Zeitschrift fur Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft*, no. 60, pp. 241-266.

___. 1977. "Zur buddhistischen Lehre von der dreifachen Leidhaftigkeit", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft. Supplementa III: Vorträge des XIX. Deutschen Orientalistentages in Freiburg*, pp. 918-931.

___. 1981. "On some Aspects of Descriptions or Theories of 'Liberating Insight' and 'Enlightenment' in Early Buddhism." In: Klaus Bruhn und Albrecht Wezler (eds.), *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus. Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf, Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien* 23, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, pp. 199-250.

___. 1982. "Versenkungspraxis und erlösende Erfahrung in der Śrāvakabhūmi." In Gerhard OBERHAMMER (ed.), *Epiphanie des Heils*, Wien: Institut für Indologie, pp. 59-85.

___. 1983. "Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden", review article. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* no. 132, pp. 407-411

___. 1983. "The Darśanamārga Section of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and its Interpretation by Tibetan Commentators (with Special Reference to Bu ston Rin chen grub)." In Ernst Steinkellner and Helmut Tauscher, eds., *Contributions on Tibetan and Buddhist Religion and Philosophy*, vol. 2. Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, pp. 259-274.

___. 1984. "Die letzten Seiten der Śrāvakabhūmi". In L.A. Hercus, et al., eds., *Indological and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on His Sixtieth Birthday*. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publikation, pp. 457-489.

___. 1985. "Buddhismus und Natur." In Raimundo Panikkar and Walter Strolz (eds.), *Die Verantwortung des Menschen fur eine bewohnbare Welt in Christentum, Hinduismus und Buddhismus*. Freiburg: Herder, pp. 100-133.

___. 1985. "Once again MSg I.8." In *Buddhism and Its Relation to Other Religions: Essays in Honour of Dr. Shuzen Kumoi on His Seventieth Birthday*. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, pp. 139-160.

___. 1986. "Critical Response". In Roland W. Neufeldt, ed., *Karma and Rebirth: Post Classical Developments*, Albany, State University of New York Press, pp. 203-230.

___. 1987. "Beitrage zur Schulzugehörigkeit und Textgeschichte kanonischer und postkanonischer Materialien." In *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayana-Literatur, Zweiter Teil*, edited by Heinz Bechert. Göttingen: Vandenhoek und Ruprecht, pp. 304-406.

___. 1987. *Ālayavijñāna: On the Origin and Early Development of a Central Concept of Yogācāra Philosophy*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

___. 1991. *The Problem of the Sentience of Plants in Earliest Buddhism.* Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

___. 1991. *Buddhism and Nature: The Lecture Delivered on the Occasion of the EXPO 1990. An Enlarged Version with Notes.* Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

___. 1995. "Mensch, Tier und Pflanze und der Tod in den älteren *Upaniṣaden*." In Gerhard Oberhammer, ed., *Im Tod gewinnt der Mensch sein Selbst: Das Phänomen des Todes in asiatischer und abendländischer Religion.* Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, pp. 43-74.

___. 1997. "The Early Buddhist Tradition and Ecological Ethics", *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, vol. 4, pp. 1-74.

___. 2000a. "Buddhism and the Ethics of Nature: Some Remarks", *The Eastern Buddhist, New Series* 32.2, pp. 26-78.

___. 2000b. "Zur zwölfgliedrigen Formel des Entstehens in Abhängigkeit", *Hōrin* 7, pp. 41-76.

___. 2000c. "Zur Entwicklung der Gestalt des Buddha", In *Buddhismus in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* vol. 4. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg, pp. 3-34.

___. 2002. "Fragments of an Early Commentary". In Jens Braarvig ed. *Buddhist Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection II.* Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection 3. Oslo: Hermes Academic Publishing, pp. 249-254.

___. 2002. "Ein weiteres Fragment aus dem Prakaraṇa: SHT VII 1697", *Wiener Zeitschrift zur Kunde Südasiens*, vol. 46, pp. 51-103.

___. 2002. "Grundbegriffe buddhistischer Ethik". Draft. In *Buddhismus in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. 7, pp. 1-19.

___. 2003. "Einige besondere Aspekte der 'Bodhisattva-Ethik' in Indien und ihre Hintergründe", *Hōrin*, vol. 10, pp. 21-46.

___. 2005. "Benefiting Oneself and Benefiting Others: A Note on *Aṅguttaranikāya* 7.64." In H.W. BODEWITZ and Minoru HARA (eds.), *Gedenkschrift J.W. de Jong.* Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, pp. 149-160.

___. 2005. *On the Problem of the External World in the* Ch'eng wei shih lun. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

___. 2005. "Meat-Eating and Nature: Buddhist Perspectives". In *Supplement to the Bulletin of the Research Institute of Bukkyō University,* pp. 183-201.

___. 2006. "Gewalt und Gewaltlosigkeit im Buddhismus: Zur Einführung." Draft. In

Buddhismus in Geschichte und Gegenwart, vol. 10, pp. 1-19.

___. 2007. "Aspects of Spiritual Practice in Early Yogācāra". *Jornal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies*, vol. 11, pp. 213-244 (ltrp).

SCHNEIDER, Johannes. 1993. *Lobpreis der Vorzüglichkeit des Buddha*. Bonn: Indica et Tibetica.

SCHOENING, Jeffrey D. 1995. *The Śālistamba Sūtra and Its Indian Commentaries*. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien.

SENART, Émile, ed. 1882-1897. *Le Mahāvastu*. 3 vols. Paris: Société Asiatique.

SGAM PO PA. 1992. *Dam chos yid bzhin nor bu thar pa rin po che'i rgyan zhes bya ba bka' phyag chu bo gnyis kyi theg pa chen po'i lam rim gyi bshad pa*. Gangs can rig brgya sgo 'byed lde mig, vol. 20. Bejing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

SGAM PO SPYAN SNGA. ca. 2002. *Phyag rgya chen po lnga ldan gyi sngon 'gro'i khrid yig bka' brgyud bla ma'i zhal lung*. [Lhasa]: no publisher.

SHERBURNE, Richard. 2000. *The Complete Works of Atīśa Śrī Dīpaṃkara Jñāna, Jo-bo-rje*. New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan.

SHINODA, Masashige (篠田 正成). 1970. "Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya no seiritsu nendai" (Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya の成立年代; *The Date of Composition of the Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya). *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 36, pp. 878-882.

SILK, Jonathan A. 2000. "The Yogācāra Bhikṣu". In *id.*, ed., *Wisdom, Compassion, and the Search for Understanding: The Buddhist Studies Legacy of Gadjin M. Nagao*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, pp. 265-314.

SCHOENING, Jeffrey D. 1995. *The Śalistambasūtra and Its Indian Commentaries*. 2 vols. Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien.

SHUKLA, Karunesha. 1973. *Śrāvakabhūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga*. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

SIMSON, Georg von. 1985. "Stil und Schulzugehörigkeit buddhistischer Sanskrittexte." In Heinz Bechert, ed., *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, part 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, pp. 76-93.

SIMONSSON, Nils. 1957. *Indo-tibetische Studien: Die Methoden der tibetischen Übersetzer, untersucht im Hinblick auf die Bedeutung ihrer Übersetzungen für die Sanskritphilologie*. Uppsala : Almquist & Wiksell.

SKILLING, Peter. 1979. "Discourse on the Four Kinds of Karma", *Jornal of Religious Studies*, no. 7, vol. 1, p. 96f.

___. 1997. *Mahāsūtras: Great Discourses of the Buddha*, vol. 2, parts 1-2. Oxford: Pali Text Society.

SNELLGROVE, David L. 1987. *Indo-Tibetan Buddhism: Indian Buddhists and their Tibetan Successors*. London: Serindia.

SNELLGROVE, David L., and Tadeusz SKORUPSKI. 1980. *The Cultural Heritage of*

Ladakh, vol._2:Zangskar and the Cave Temples of Ladakh. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.

Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group (声聞地研究会). 1998. *Śrāvakabhūmi: Revised Sanskrit Text and Japanese Translation. The First Chapter*. (瑜伽論声聞地・第一瑜伽処・サンスクリット語テキストと和訳; Yugaronshōmonji, Daiichi Yugasho: Sansukurittogo tekisuto to wayaku) . Tokyo: Sankibō Bosshorin.

STCHERBATSKY, Theodore. 1923. *The Central Conception of Buddhism and the Meaning of the Word "Dharma"*. London: Royal Asiatic Society.

____. 1970. *Madhyānta-vibhanga: Discourse on the Discrimination Between Middle and Extremes*. Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag.

STEARNS, Cyrus. 1999. *The Buddha from Dolpo: A Study of the Life and Thought of the Tibetan Master Dolpopa Sherab rgyal mtshan.* Albany: SUNY.

STEIN, Rolf Alfred. 1972. *Tibetan civilization*. London: Faber and Faber.

STEINKELLNER, Ernst. 1985 "Paralokasiddhi-Texts". In *Buddhism and Its Relation to Other Religions: Essays in Honour of Dr. Shuzen Kumoi on His Seventieth Birthday.* Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, pp. 215-224.

____. 2004. *A Tale of Leaves: Sanskrit Manuscripts in Tibet, Their Past and Future.* Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences.

SUZUKI, Daisetz T. (鈴木 大拙), ed. 1955-1961. *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition.* Tokyo, Kyoto: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute.

SYED, Renate. 2003. "Tṛtīyā Prakṛti: Das dritte Geschlecht im alten Indien". *Asiatische Studien,* no. 50.1, pp. 1-63.

SZERB, Josef. 1990. *Bu ston's History of Buddhism in Tibet.* Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wisenschaften.

SUGURO, Shinjō (勝呂 信静). 1989. *Shokiyuishikishisō no kenkyū* (初期唯識思想の研究; Studies on Early Vijñaptimātra Philosophy). Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

TARTHANG TULKU. 1977. "A History of the Buddhist Dharma." In *Crystal Mirror*, vol. 5, pp. 3-330.

TAKASAKI, Jikidō (高崎 直道). 1983. *Bukkyō nyūmon* (仏教入門; **An Introduction to Buddhism*). Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.

____. 1987. *An Introduction to Buddhism*. Translated by Rolf W. Giebel. Tokyo: Tōyō Gakkai.

____, Zuihō YAMAGUCHI (山口 瑞鳳), and Noriaki HAKAYAMA (袴谷 憲昭), eds. 1980. *sDe dge Tibetan Trīpiṭaka: bsTan 'gyur, Sems-tsam* section, vols. 3-13. Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai.

TAKASAKI, Masayoshi (高崎 正芳). 1956. "Daijō abidatsumashūron oyobi zōshūron to sanjūju anne shaku to no kanren ni tsuite" (大乗阿毘達磨集論及び雑集論と三十頌安慧釈との関連について; A Comparative Study of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*

and *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* in Relation to *Triṃśikabhāṣya*). *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 116-117 (rtlp).

___. 1971. "Daijōabidatsumazōshūron no kanzōdenshō ni tsuite" (大乗阿毘達磨雑集論の漢蔵伝承について; The Formation of the Commentary on the *Abhidharma-samuccaya* and Its Author). *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 513-516 (rltp).

TATIA, Nathmal, ed. 1976. *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāsyam*. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

TATZ, Mark. 1986. *Asaṅga's Chapter on Ethics with the Commentary of Tsong kha pa.* Lewiston: Edwin Mellen.

___. 1994 . *The Skill in Means (Upāyakauśalya) Sūtra* . Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

TAYLOR, Arnold C., ed. 1894-1897. *Kathāvatthu*. 2 vols. London: Pāli Text Society.

THANISSARO BHIKKHU [Geoffrey DeGraff]. 1994. *The Buddhist Monastic Code: The Patimokkha Training Rules Translated and Explained.* Valley Center: Metta Forest Monastery. Unpaginated electronic text, retrieved 5 January 2004 from http://www.accesstoinsight.org/lib/modern/bmc/.

___. 1996. *The Wings to Awakening: An Anthology from the Pali Canon.* Berre: Dhamma Dana Publications.

THAR PA LO TSĀ BA NYI MA RGYAL MTSHAN. 2006. "Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i de kho na nyid 'byung ba." In DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG ZHIB 'JUG KHANG, ed., *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 43, pp. 11-556.

TŌDŌ, Akiyasu (藤堂 明保), Akira MATSUMOTO (松本 昭), and Akira TAKEDA (竹田晃), eds. 1993. *Kanjigen*. CD-ROM. Tokyo: Gakushū Kenkyūsha.

TOLA, Fernando, and Carmen DRAGONETTI. 2004. *Being As Consciousness: The Yogācāra Philosophy of Buddhism.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

TOKIWA, Daijō (常盤 大定) and Reimon YŪKI (結城 令聞), trans. 1935. *Daijō abidatsumazōshūron* (大乗阿毘達磨雑集論). Kokuyaku Issaikyō, Yugabu, vol. 10. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha.

Tōyō Bunko Chibetto Kenkyūshitsu. 1997. *Sa bcad of rJe yab sras gsung 'bum*. Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko.

TRALEG KYABGON RINPOCHE. 1998. *The Abhidharmasamuccaya: Teachings by the Venerable Traleg Kyabgon Rinpoche.* Third Edition. Carlton North: Kagyu E-Vam Institute.

TRENCKNER , Vilhelm, et al., eds. 1924-. *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

TRIPĀṬĪS, Ch. 1962. *Fünfundzwanzig Sūtras des Nidānasamyukta*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

TSERING GYALBO, GUNTRAM HAZOD, and PER K. SØRENSEN. 2000. *Civilization at the*

Foot of Mount Sham-po: The Royal House of lHa Bug-pa-can and the History of g.Ya'-bzang. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

TSONG KHA PA Blo bzang grags pa. 1985. *Byang chub lam rim che ba*. Xining: mTsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

___. 2000. *The Great Treatise on the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment*, vol. 1. Translated by the Lamrim Chenmo Translation Commitee. Ithaca: Snow Lion.

___. 2002. *The Great Treatise on the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment*, vol. 2. Translated by the Lamrim Chenmo Translation Commitee. Ithaca: Snow Lion.

TSUKAMOTO, Keishō (塚本 啓祥), et al. 1990. *Bongo butten no kenkyū III: Ronshohen* (梵語仏典の研究 III：論書篇; *Research on Sanskrit Buddhist Texts, Part Three: Śāstra Volume). Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.

TSONAWA, Lobsang N. 1985. *Indian Buddhist Pandits form "The Jewel Garland of Buddhist History"*. Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives.

TUCCI, Guiseppe. 1929. "Buddhist Logic before Diṅnāga (Asaṅga, Vasubandhu, Tarka-śāstras)", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 7, pp. 451-488.

UI, Hakuju, et al., eds. 1934. *Seizōdaizōkyōsōmokuroku* (西蔵大蔵教總目録; *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons: Bkah-hgyur and Bstan-hgyur*). Sendai: Tōhoku Imperial University.

VAN DER KUIJP, Leonard W.J. 1998. "Buddhism and Language: A Study of Indo-Tibetan Scholasticism by José Ignacio Cabezón" Review article. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol.118, no.4, pp. 563-567.

___. 2004. "U rgyan pa Rin chen dpal (1230-1309), Part Two: For Emperor Qubilai? His Garland of Tales about Rivers." In: Christoph CÜPPERS (ed.), *The Relationship Between Religion and State* (chos srid zung 'brel) *in Traditional Tibet*, Lumbini: Lumibini International Research Institute, pp. 299-339.

VERHAGEN, Pieter Cornelis. 1994. *A History of Sanskrit Grammatical Literature in Tibet. Volume 1: Transmission of the Canonical Literature.* Leiden: Brill.

___. 2001. *A History of Sanskrit Grammatical Literature in Tibet. Volume 2: Assimilation into Indigenous Scholarship.* Leiden: Brill.

VETTER, Tilmann. 1988. *The Ideas and Meditative Practices of Early Buddhism*. Leiden: Brill.

___. 2000. *The "Khandha Passages" in the Vinayapiṭaka and the Four Main Nikāyas*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

WACKERNAGEL, Jakob and Albert DEBRUNNER. 1957-1964. *Altindische Grammatik*. 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht.

WALDRON, William S. 2003. *The Buddhist Unconscious: The Ālaya-vijñāna in the Context of Indian Buddhist Thought*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

WALDSCHMIDT, Ernst, et al., ed. 1965-. *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*.

Wiesbaden: Steiner.

WALLESER, Max, ed. 1930. *Manorathapūranī: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Aṅguttara-Nikāya*, vol. II. London: Pali Text Society.

WALPOLA RAHULA. 1971. *Le compendium de la super-doctrine (philosophie) (Abhidharmasamuccaya) d'Asanga*. Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient.

WALTERS, Jonathan S. 1990. "The Buddha's Bad karma: A Problem in the History of Theravada Buddhism", *Numen* 37, pp. 90-95.

WANGCHUK, Dorji. 2007. *The Resolve to Become a Buddha. A Study of the Bodhicitta Concept in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

WARREN, Henry Clarke. 1950. *Visuddhimagga of Buddhaghosācariya*. Revised by Dharmananda Kosambi. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

WATANABE, Kaikyoku (渡邊 海旭). 1907. "A Chinese Collection of Itivuttaka". *Journal of the Pāli Text Society*, 1906-1907, pp. 44-49.

WHITNEY, William Dwight. 1993. *Sanskrit Grammar*. Reprint of the fifth edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

WILLIAMS, Paul. 1989. *Mahāyāna Buddhism: The Doctrinal Foundations*. London and New York: Routledge.

WILLEMEN, Charles, Bart DESSEIN and Collet COX, eds. 1997. *Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

WOGIHARA, Unrai (荻原 雲来; OGIWARA, Unrai), ed. 1932. *Abhisamayālamkārālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā (Commentary on Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā) by Haribhadra, Together with the Text Commented on.* Parts 1 and 2. Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko.

___. 1930-1936. *Bodhisattvabhūmi: A Statement of the Whole Course of the Bodhisattva (Being Fifteenth Section of the Yogācārabhūmi)*. Tokyo: [published by the author].

___. 1936. *Sputārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā: The Work of Yaśomitra*. Reprint. Tokyo: The Sankibo Bookstore.

XINGYUN (星雲), et al., eds. 1988. *Foguang dacidian* (佛光大辞典; Foguang Buddhist Dictionary). Kaohsiung: Foguang zhubanshe.

YAMABE, Nobuyoshi (山部 能宜). 1998. "Self and Other in the Yogācāra Tradition." In *Kitabatake tensei hakushi kokinen ronbunshū: Nihon bukkyō bunka ronsō* (北畠典生博士古稀記念論文集：日本仏教文化論叢), vol. 1, pp. 17-38.

YAMAGUCHI, Susumu. 1934. *Sthiramati: Madhāntavibhāgatīkā, Exposition systemamatique du Yogācāravijñaptivāda*. Nagoya: Librairie Hajinkaku.

YOKOYAMA, Kōitsu (横山 紘一) and Takayuki HIROSAWA (廣澤 隆之). 1996. *Kanbonzō taishō, Yugashijiron sōsakuin* (漢梵蔵対照・瑜伽師地論総索引, Index to the Yogācārabhūmi: Chinese-Sanskrit-Tibetan). Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.

YONGS 'DZIN YE SHES RGYAL MTSHAN. 1990. *Lam rim bla ma brgyud pa'i rnam thar*. Zi ling: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun Khang.

____. 1998. *Sems sems byung gi sdom tshig nor bu'i phreng ba dang de'i 'grel ba blo gsal mgul rgyan*. Reprint of the 1988 edition. Peking: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

YOSHIMOTO, Shingyō (吉元 信行). 1973. "Walpola Rahula, *Le compendium de la super-doctrine (philosophie) (Abhidharmasamuccaya) d'Asaṅga*", review article. *Bukkyōgaku seminā* 18, pp. 91-97.

____. 1977. "Textual Notes on the *Abhidharmasamuccaya", Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 50, pp. 18-20.

____. 1982. "Busshitsu gainen no daijō abidarumateki bunseki: Shikiun to henne" (物質概念の大乗アビダルマ的分析・色蘊と変壊; The Analysis of Matter in the Mahāyāna-Abhidharma: *rūpa-skandha* and *rūpaṇa*). *Ōtani Gakuhō* 233, pp. 24-36.

ZHE CHEN RGYAL TSHAB 'GYUR MED PADMA RNAM RGYAL. 1994. *Zhe chen rgyal tshab chos 'byung*. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

ZIMMERMANN, Michael. 2002. *A Buddha Within: The Tathāgatagarbhasūtra; The Earliest Exposition of the Buddha-Nature Teaching in India*. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology.

ABBREVIATIONS AND PRIMARY SOURCES

• For publication details of primary and secondary sources in the list of abbreviations, see the bibliography above. For the sources in the Pāli, Tibetan and Chinese canons, or those referred to by their ACIP number, see the respective catalogues.

• Abbreviations for various translations or editions are to be understood in analogy to the following examples: AKBh - *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (page numbers refer to the standard Sanskrit edition); $AKBh_t$ - *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya,* Tibetan version; $AKBh_{t,D}$ - *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, Tibetan version, Derge edition; AS_c - Chinese version of the AS.

• Numbers followed by comma indicate: page,line; numbers followed by full stop: chapter.verse.

• Pāli canon: AN V, p. 292 means page 292 in volume five of the *Aṅguttaranikāya* (romanized edition of the Pāli Text Society), MN, no. 135 means sutta number 135 in the *Majjhimanikāya.*

• Chinese Āgamas: SĀ 307a10 means T 99 (*Saṃyuktāgama*), page 307 and so on.

• TBRC codes: TBRC-P2147 means resource code for person P2147 of the Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center catalogue. In this context, P stands for person, W for a work, G for a geographical location.

• Variant readings in the Taishō edition: For the sake of simplicity, I use the one-character abbreviations of the Taishō edition itself. An overview is contained in the beginning of each Taishō volume.

• As a rule, the most common editions are used to provide page and line numbers (e.g. SHUKLA's *Śrāvakabhūmi* edition for ŚrBh. Any alterations to those editions (be it based on the MS or newer editions or else) are indicated explicitly.

Abhidharmadīpa - JAINI, ed., *Abhidharmadīpa*

Abhidharmakośaṭīkā Upāyikā, by Śamathadeva - (t,D 4059)

ACIP - catalogue numbers of the Asian Classics Input Project

AK - *Abhidharmakośakārikā* (text included in AKBh)

AKBh, *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* by Vasubandhu - PRADHAN, ed., *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*

$AKBh_{c,P}$ (PARAMĀRTHA's translation) - (T 1559)

$AKBh_{c,X}$ - (XUANZANG's translation) - (T 1558)

AKBh-Index-Skt - HIRAKAWA, *Kusharon sakuin: Dai ichi bu*

AKBh-Index-Chin - HIRAKAWA, *Kusharon sakuin: Dai ni bu*

AKBh-Index-Tib - HIRAKAWA, *Kusharon sakuin: Dai san bu*

AKVy, *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* by Yaśomitra - WOGIHARA, ed., *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*

AS - *Abhidharmasamuccaya*

ASBh, *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* - TATIA, ed., *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣyam*

AS-Bo-dong-bShad - BO DONG PHYOGS LAS RNAM RGYAL, "Kun las btus pa de nyid bshad pa"

AS-Bo-dong-Verse - BO DONG PHYOGS LAS RNAM RGYAL, "Kun las btus pa"

AS-bSod-grags - BSOD NAMS GRAGS PA, "dKa' ba'i gnad grol ba'i dka' 'grel"

AS-Bu-ston - BU STON, "Kun las btus pa'i rnam bshad"

AS-dPang-lo - DPANG LO TSĀ BA BLO GROS BRTAN PA, "Kun las btus pa'i rgya cher 'grel pa"

AS-gZhan-dga' - GZHAN PHAN CHOS KYI SNANG BA, "Kun las btus pa'i mchan 'grel"

AS-'Jam-dbyangs - 'JAM DBYANGS BLO GROS, "Kun las btus pa'i 'grel pa"

AS-Mi-pham - 'JU MI PHAM, "rNam grangs sna tshogs bshad pa"

AS-Red-mda' - RED MDA' BA GZHON NU BLO GROS, "Kun las btus pa'i snying po"

AS-rGyal-tshab - RGYAL TSHAB RJE, "Kun las btus pa'i rnam bshad legs par bshad pa"

AS-Rig-ral - BCOM LDAN RIG PA'I RAL GRI, "Kun las btus pa'i rnam bshad"

AS-Śāk - ŚĀ KYA MCHOG LDAN, "Kun las btus pa'i rnam par bshad pa"

AS-Thar-lo - THAR PA LO TSĀ BA NYI MA RGYAL MTSHAN, "Kun las btus pa'i de kho na nyid"

ASVy, *Abhidharmasamuccayavyākhyā* by Sthiramati (?) - (t,P 5555, t,D 4054, T 1606)

BHSD - EDGERTON, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, vol 2.

Bodhisattvabhūmi - DUTT ed., *Bodhisattvabhūmiḥ*

c - Chinese version

C - Co-ne edition

Cheng weishi lun (成唯識論), by XUANZANG - (T 1585)

CPD - TRECKNER, et al., eds., *Critical Pāli Dictionary*

D - Derge edition

Daśabhūmikasūtra - RAHDER, *Daśabhūmikasūtra*

dBu ma la 'jug pa'i 'grel bshad, by JAYĀNANDA - (t,D 3870)

Deb ther sngon po - 'GOS LO TSĀ BA GZHON NU DPAL, *Blue Annals*

Enc.Bud. - *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*

Foguang dacidian - XINGYUN, et al., eds. *Fo guang da ci dian*

G - Golden Manuscript ("Ganden edition")

Xianyang shengjiao lun (顯揚聖教論), by Asaṅga - (T 1602)

KSi, *Karmasiddhi*, by Vasubandhu - MUROJI, ed., *Jōgōron* (t,P 5563, t,D 4062)

Kathāvatthu - TAYLOR, ed., *Kathāvatthu*

Karmavibhaṅga - KUDŌ, ed., *Karmavibhaṅga*

Las rnam par 'byed pa, by A TI SHA - in Sherburne, *Complete Works of Atīśa*, pp. 494-517

Legs bshad gser phreng, by TSONG KHA PA - (ACIP S5412)

ltrp - left-to-right pagination (in sources that also use rtlp)

Lung phran tshegs kyi rnam par bshad pa - (ACIP TD4115)

* *Mahāvibhāṣā* (XUANZANG's translation) - (T 1545)

Mahāyanasaṃgrahabhāṣya (PARAMĀRTHA's translation) - (T 1595)

Mahāyānasaṃgrahopanibandhana - Tibetan version in GRIFFITHS, et al., *The Realm of Awakening*

MaVyu, *Mahāvyutpatti* - SAKAKI, *Mahāvyutpatti*

Mi dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam bstan pa, by A TI SHA - in Sherburne, *Complete Works of Atīśa*, pp. 488-493

MSA - LÉVI, *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*

MSg, *Mahāyānasaṃgraha* - LAMOTTE, ed., *Somme*

N - Narthang edition

P - Peking edition - SUZUKI, *Peking Edition*

ParSg - *Paryāyasaṃgrahaṇī* section of the YBh (t,P 5542, t,D 4041)

PTSD - RHYS DAVIDS and STEDE, eds., *Pāli-English Dictionary*

rtlp - right-to-left pagination (in Japanese and Chinese language publications)

SĀ, *Samyuktāgama* (T 99)

Saṅghabhedavastu - GNOLI, ed., *Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu*

SaNiSū - LAMOTTE, *Saṃdhinirmocana Sūtra*

Saṅghabhedavastu - Gnoli, *Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu*

SHT - catalogue number in WALDSCHMIDT, et al., ed., *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*

Śikṣāsamuccaya, by ŚĀNTIDEVA - BENDALL, *Compendium of Buddhistic Teachings*

ŚrBh, *Śrāvakabhūmi* - *Śrāvakabhūmi* part of the YBh: SHUKLA, *Śrāvakabhūmi* (t,P 5537, t,D 4036)

SWTF - Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, ed., *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*

t - Tibetan version

T - Taishō edition

TBRC - Resource code in the catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center

Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan, by SGAM PO PA - SGAM PO PA, *Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan*

TrBh, *Triṃśikābhāṣya*, by Sthiramati - in LÉVI, *Deux traités*

Udānavarga - BERNHARD, *Udānavarga*

Visuddhimagga - WARREN, ed., *Visuddhimagga*

YBh-Index-CST - YOKOYAMA and HIROSAWA, *Kanbonzō*

Viṃśatikākārikā - in LÉVI, *Deux traités* (t,P 5557)

Viṃśatikāvṛtti - in LÉVI, *Deux traités* (t,P 5558)

VinSg, *Viniścayasaṃgrahaṇī* part of the YBh (t,P 5539, t,D 4038)

YBh, *Yogācārabhūmi* - BHATTACHARYA, *Yogācārabhūmi*, or the other parts of the YBh, such as ŚrBh, VinSg, **Vinayasaṃgrahaṇī*, ParSg, etc. For an overview, see KRITZER, *Vasubandhu*, p. xvi. (T 1579, t,P 5536, t,D 4035)

SELECT INDEX

This index contains only a subjective choice of terms and occurrences. For a more complete search I have to refer the reader to SAKUMA's *Index* of the ASBh or the available Tibetan and Chinese e-texts of AS, ASBh and ASVy. When a page number is set in *italics*, the term as such does not appear on the page. For technical reasons, Tibetan words beginning in *'(a)* are listed under a separate heading and page ranges are indicated by single page numbers. References to YBh passages outside the *Basic Section* are made by means of the Chinese page number, and the *index locorum* of the AS and ASBh refers only to passages outside the *karman* section.